INDIAN POLITICS

with an introduction by

W. C. BONNERJEE, *Bar-at-Law.*

PUBLISHED BY

G. A. NATESAN, B. A.

MADRAS.

Indian Politics

MADRAS

G. A. NATESAN & CO, PRINTERS

1898

NOTE.

This book is intended to present in a handy form the Indian view of many problems of pressing importance in this country. To most persons, the study of these questions at first hand in original documents must, on account of their great bulk, be an impossible task. A short authoritative exposition of them such as is for the first time presented in a collected form in this book, has been felt to be a great desideratum.

The writers of the various articles, as may be readily seen from their names, are well known public men of various parts of this country and may claim to speak with authority upon the questions they handle. The publisher cannot adequately acknowledge his indebtedness to these gentlemen, who have, at considerable personal inconvenience, readily responded to his request, looking for their sole reward in any service that the book may render towards creating a more cordial understanding between England and India.

It is understood that Mr. Dutt's article originally appeared under another title in the Asiatic Quarterly Review. It has since been specially rewritten for this book and it appears here with the kind permission of the editor of that Journal.

THE PUBLISHER.

CONTENTS.

INTRODUCTION ... ...

W. C. Bonnerjee, Esq, Bar-at-law.

PART I:—ORIGINAL ARTICLES.

PAGE.

THE INDIAN NATIONAL CONGRESS, ...

Eardley Norton, Esq, Bar-at-Law.

THE ECONOMIC CONDITION OF THE PEOPLE OF INDIA, 33

Rao Bahadur R. N. Mudholkar, B.A. L.L.B.

INDIAN ASPIRATIONS UNDER BRITISH RULE, ... 49

Romesh Chunder Dutt, Esq, C.I.E.

INDIA AND THE CURRENCY QUESTION, ... 59

Dadabhai Naoroji, Esq.

THE PERMANENT SETTLEMENT QUESTION, ... 89

John Adam, Esq, M.A, Bar-at-Law.

THE POVERTY OF INDIA, ... 100

Alfred Nundy, Esq, Bar-at-Law.

LINES OF LEGISLATION IN INDIA, ... 135

P. S. Sivaswamy Aiyar, Esq, B.A. B.L.

THE JURY SYSTEM IN INDIA,... 141

Sorab Pestonji N. Wadia, Esq.

THE ADMINISTRATION OF JUSTICE IN INDIA, ... 153

V. Krishnaswami Aiyar, Esq. B.A. B.L.

THE STATUS OF INDIANS ABROAD,... 168

G. Parameswaran Pillai, Esq, B.A.

RAILWAYS IN INDIA, ... 181

G. Subramania Aiyar, Esq, B.A.

PART II.

All the past 13 Congress Presidential Addresses in full.

PART III.

The Resolutions of the past 13 Congresses in full.

CONTENTS

W. C. Bonnerjee, Esq, Bar-at-law.

PART I: ORIGINAL ARTICLES

Gautley Herford, Esq, Bar-at-Law.

Rao Bahadur R. N. Mudholkar, B.A. LL.B.

Romesh Chunder Dutt, Esq, C.I.E.

Dadabhai Naoroji, Esq.

John Adam, Esq, M.A. Bar-at-Law.

Alfred Nundy, Esq. Bar-at-Law.

P. S. Sivaswamy Aiyar, Esq. B.A. B.L.

Sorabji Pestonji N. Wacha, Esq.

V. Krishnaswami Aiyar, Esq. B.A. B.L.

G. Parameswaram Pillai, Esq. B.A.

G. Subramania Aiyar, Esq, B.A.

PART II

All the past 12 Congress Presidential Addresses in full.

PART III

The Resolutions of the past 12 Congresses in full.

INTRODUCTION.

The articles contained in this book are well worthy of the attention of all those who are interested in the welfare of India and therefore in the continuance of British rule in this country. They are written by men who possess thorough knowledge of the subjects dealt with by them and in a style which, I venture to think, will command respect from even the most critical of literary critics. The title of the book, though appropriate enough, hardly does justice to its contents. It is not simply "Indian politics" that are to be found in it but matters of the gravest importance to Great Britain and her great dependency. Indian politicians, both Native and European, all feel the apathy of the British public, as regards Indian politics, very keenly. No doubt there is some excuse for this apathy, for their own multitudinous affairs at home are enough to engross the attention of the most energetic amongst them. Nevertheless, it is but right that an Imperial nation like the British should devote some attention to the affairs of India. No body desires that the British public or the Imperial Parliament should meddle itself with the details of Indian Administration. These may be fitly left in the hands of the Government in India. But the principles on which the administration is to be carried on are surely deserving of attention on the part of those who may be said to be the ultimate court of appeal in relation to India and her government. In recent times the initiation of all policy and even the mode in which that policy should be given effect to with regard to the government of this country, have passed into the hands of Her Majesty's Secretary of State for India. An appeal to him, therefore, against any decision of the Government of India in India can be of no avail, for the appeal to him is really an appeal against his own decision. But I need not further enlarge on this topic. The articles in this book, though they do not directly touch on this point, sufficiently show how necessary it is for the good government of this country that the British public should take an intelligent interest in its affairs. Discussion of Indian affairs in England, even when perfunctory, has a good effect on the minds of our educated people. It shows them that their country and her people are not altogether out of the minds of their fellow subjects in Great Britain and it helps to cement their loyalty to their rulers. Why is it that the educated classes of this country make so many sacrifices to maintain the British Committee of the Indian National Congress in London and those who know how straitened the

circumstances of the bulk of these classes are can alone appreciate the extent of these sacrifices? They know that the Committee are engaged in disseminating information about their country amongst the British people. They realise that the task of rousing the attention of the British people to matters Indian is extremely difficult. They feel that no great measure of success has yet been achieved by the labours of the Committee, incessant though they have been and are. Yet they go on subscribing large sums of money year by year in the hope that at some time or other the Committee may succeed in inducing the British public to think of the responsibility they owe to the people of India. They have a firm faith in the love of justice and fair-play on the part of the British public and they know that when once that public begin to pay heed to the affairs of India, their position as citizens of the British Empire will be improved and with this improvement will come many other blessings of British rule which have hitherto been withheld from them. I venture to hope that this book may be of help to the British Committee in their work.

It is, I think, right that I should, as shortly as possible, deal with a charge which has of late been freely advanced against the educated portion of Her Majesty's British Indian subjects. It is that the educated Indian is seditious at heart, which in plain language, means that he desires the overthrow of British rule in India. No charge can be more absolutely devoid of foundation than this. The educated Indian like his uneducated countrymen of the present generation has known no Government of his country except the British Government, he has learnt from his studies what the condition of his country was before this Government was firmly established on the land, he sees daily the improvements that have been made and are being made in the condition of his country, he experiences daily the great benefits which British rule has conferred on her, he himself is the product of that benign policy which introduced Western education into his country, he has everything to lose and nothing to gain by the overthrow of the present Government. But yet, it is gravely asserted by eminent personages in high places that the educated Indian is seditious. The educated Indian has his faults, but whatever these faults may be it cannot be asserted that he is blind to his own material interests and it is his own material interests that sway him altogether towards being loyal and contented, as loyal subjects should be contented, towards the Government. Indeed the principle on which the Indian National Congress is based is that British rule should be permanent and abiding in India and that, given this axiom, it is the duty of educated Indians to endeavour to the best of their power to help their rulers so to govern the country as to

improve her material prosperity and make the people of all classes and communities happy and prosperous and contented as subjects of the British Empire. The sooner this erroneous but very mischievous notion that the educated Indian is seditious is given up the better for the country. The Indian National Congress consists entirely of educated Indians and as Mr. Eardley Norton in his article on that body well expresses it, "India accepts England's rule gladly and gratefully because she believes that the English is the greatest of all the nations of the earth &c., &c., &c. Our rule is accepted because it is honest."

It will probably be news to many that the Indian National Congress, as it was originally started and as it has since been carried on, is in reality the work of the Marquis of Dufferin and Ava when that nobleman was Governor-General of India. Mr. A. O. Hume, C.B., had, in 1884, conceived the idea that it would be of great advantage to the country if leading Indian politicians could be brought together once a year to discuss social matters and be upon friendly footing with one another. He did not desire that politics should form part of their discussion, for, there were recognised political bodies in Calcutta, Bombay, Madras and other parts of India, and he thought that these bodies might suffer in importance if when Indian politicians from different parts of the country came together, they discussed politics. His idea further was that the Governor of the Province where the politicians met should be asked to preside over them and that thereby greater cordiality should be established between the official classes and the non-official Indian politicians. Full of these ideas he saw the noble Marquis when he went to Simla early in 1885 after having in the December previous assumed the Viceroyalty of India. Lord Dufferin took great interest in the matter and after considering over it for some time he sent for Mr. Hume and told him that, in his opinion, Mr. Hume's project would not be of much use. He said there was no body of persons in this country who performed the functions which Her Majesty's Opposition did in England. The newspapers, even if they really represented the views of the people, were not reliable and as the English were necessarily ignorant of what was thought of them and their policy in native circles, it would be very desirable in the interests as well of the rulers as of the ruled that Indian politicians should meet yearly and point out to the Government in what respects the administration was defective and how it could be improved; and he added that an assembly such as he proposed should not be presided over by the local Governor for in his presence the people might not like to speak out their minds. Mr. Hume was convinced by Lord Dufferin's arguments and when he placed the two schemes, his own and

Lord Dufferin's, before leading politicians in Calcutta, Bombay, Madras and other parts of the country, the latter unanimously accepted Lord Dufferin's scheme and proceeded to give effect to it. Lord Dufferin had made it a condition with Mr. Hume that his name in connection with the scheme of the Congress should not be divulged so long as he remained in the country, and this condition was faithfully maintained and none but the men consulted by Mr. Hume knew anything about the matter.

Since its establishment educated India has laboured hard, under difficulties of no mean order, to make the Congress movement a success. That it has been successful beyond the most sanguine expectations of those who took part in the first Congress can be gathered from the figures given in Mr. Norton's article to which I have referred. The subjects discussed have been of varying importance, but whatever their importance, they have all received earnest and careful attention. It would not be a human organisation if it could be said of it that it has committed no mistakes. But the mistakes notwithstanding, the Congress stands before the world as one of the marvellous successes of British Rule in India.

W. C. BONNERJEE.

CALCUTTA, *December 20th* 1898.

THE INDIAN NATIONAL CONGRESS.

---***---

EARDLEY NORTON, ESQ. *Barrister-at-Law.*

The history of the rise and development of British power in India is full of startling and fascinating romance. This all who read admit. But not all equally perceive that one of its greatest lessons is the lesson of that gradual, yet ceaseless, evolution which, with the inexorable logic of events, is shaping the destinies of the people of India in strict consonance with the principles which from the first have governed her intercourse with England. The India of to-day is the outcome of no blind chance, of no mere freak. She has been built up of design. For good or for ill she is what England has made her. If her aspirations of to-day be wise and good and generous, the merit of it lies in great measure with England. If her requests be unreasonable, her ambitions impracticable, with England lies the blame.

Let me attempt a very brief review. The handful of English merchants whose commercial instincts first sent them to India in quest of Eastern treasure rose by quick bounds into the dignity of the East India Company, guaranteed by successive Charters from the Crown. It was not long before the Company, partly from the pressure of its surroundings, partly from the acquisitive characteristics of its servants, expanded from a pure trading corporation into a territorial ruler. In the fight for life it fought and conquered France in India, though the skill of Dupleix had at one time nearly wrested for ever for his master's crown the jewel of which Englishmen are so justly proud in the diadem of their Queen. In the dissension and the weakness of the Indian chiefs Clive and Warren Hastings found their opportunity and their strength. The decaying Moghul Empire was a bait too tempting not to be seized. England lent her military aid now to one combatant, now to the other, and extracted, much to her own advantage, territorial advantages from both. The possessions thus acquired by diplomacy, shadowed by the sword, were slowly though surely consolidated, but over their continued retention hung the constant fear that coalition between the disunited Indian chieftains might imperil, if not oust, the hard won acquisitions of the Company's servants. The system of alliance had been tried and had so far done its work well. But it was unsuited to the growing necessities of England's political position in India, and it gave way to a new

system better adapted to the ever-increasing responsibilities with which British power was daily clothing itself in the land. Politically, and for present purposes, this new departure marks the first step in the evolution which I trace.

Clive, Hastings, and Cornwallis had been among the earliest and the greatest to contribute to the growth of the British power. It was left to the brothers Wellesley—Richard, the charming classic, afterwards Governor-General, and Arthur, the conqueror of Napoleon—to discern that if British rule was to be constant it must be paramount. It could brook no rivals near its throne. The ghost of French ascendancy must be laid at once and for all time, the system of alliance must make room for a system of protectorates. Anticipating the joint action of the French and Tippoo Sahib, Wellesley promptly invaded Mysore in 1799. The capture of Seeringapatam speedily closed that campaign, and in 1803 Wellesley turning his attention to the Peishwa put the seal upon his brilliant undertaking by the successful issue of the wars against Scindia and the Raja of Berar. The treaties which followed on these accomplished two purposes. They extinguished the French and they shattered the Mahratta power. "Forty millions of populations and ten millions of revenue" were added to the British dominions, and England had made sure of the first step upon that ladder which she has ultimately climbed to the permanent exclusion, as is hoped, of all her other rivals throughout the world. Wellesley's policy assured the success of England's new political departure. The way had been won from alliance to protection. The status of the native chiefs had been lowered. They were no longer treated on terms of equality. They were to be thenceforth but distinguished subordinates whose armies were only to fulfil the requirements of puppets on parade, guaranteed against each other and rendered impotent against themselves and against England. The princes of India found their occupation gone. They were no longer permitted to war upon each other; an unseen genius was everywhere making its influence felt. Order was slowly rising out of chaos. Lawlessness was sulkily bowing its head before the imperious commands of an overlord who would brook no denial. The chiefs were publicly invited to govern well. The evils of misrule were politely pointed out to them, but they felt that the substance had gone from them and with the shadow they were not contented. There was only one alternative left and they took it. The proud leaders of daring horsemen surrendered themselves to habitual self-indulgence. Sensuality and debauchery became the badges of a decadent chivalry. Not for the first time in the worlds history wine and women played a decisive role. Sunk in their self-indulgence, deaf alike to their subjects' entreaties and to the warnings of that mysterious power which had thrown over them unasked the aegis of its

protection, the princes of India were startled out of their harems and their libations by the sudden incursion of an unlooked for, yet not undeserved, Nemesis.

Across the panorama of great events there moves no greater figure than that of Dalhousie. Into the morality of his methods it is not the purpose of this essay to enquire. His ambitions have given us Jhansi, Satara, Oudh. Some there are who believe that they gave us also the mutiny. His hand has writ his name large on the parchments of Indian history, and his actions have made possible the India of to-day. Swift, stern and silent, he glided over the stage of history, avenging, punishing, annexing, always in the name of God and of a civilisation righteously angered at the misdeeds of the besotted chieftains of the North. There was one angry outburst against the punitive intervention of England's might, a few more cruelties added to the list of wrongs which it had been the duty of England—self-imposed or Divine according to different schools—to erase, and there was heard no further public protest against the policy which had been handed augmented yet intact by its authors the brothers Wellesley through a long line of illustrious lieutenants to be the germ of a newer policy, of a greater advance and of a more adventuresome development. The selfishness and debauchery of the princes of India had rendered possible, if not necessary, the second step in the history of Indian political evolution.

The mutiny of fifty-seven had hardly spent itself, and the echoes of the Cawnpore horrors were still ringing in the ears of Englishmen, when Her Majesty issued that Proclamation to which all Indians turn as to the great Charter of their liberties. The gift was trebled by the method of its grant. The land was still throbbing with the crisis through which it had passed. The air was full of cries for vengeance. The Governor-General had been scoffingly pelted with the attribute of a mistaken virtue. Suddenly from amidst the noise and confusion emerged the figure of a royal woman, cool, collected, pitiful, who of her regal bounty spontaneously showered upon India, cowed and trembling, the sacrament of forgiveness and the promise of a new life. It was thus she spoke :—

"*We hold ourselves bound to the natives of our Indian territories by the same obligations of duty which bind us to all our other subjects, and those obligations, by the blessing of Almighty God, we shall faithfully and conscientiously fulfil.*"

"*And it is our further will that, so far as may be, our subjects, of whatever race or creed, be freely and impartially admitted to offices in our service, the duties of which they may be qualified, by their education, ability, and integrity, duly to discharge.*"

"*In their prosperity will be our strength, in their contentment our security, and in their gratitude our best reward. And may the God of all Power grant to us, and to those in authority under us strength to carry out these our wishes for the good of our people.*"

Those words are part of the daily life of every educated Indian. Men of all castes and of all professions turn to them as Christian men turn to their Bible, for comfort, for inspiration, for hope. Have the Queen's promises been kept? A little further on, and the question shall be answered from the lips of English statesmen not prone to throw discredit upon the country of their birth. Meantime, the Proclamation marked the dawn of a new era. Hitherto the policy of England's statesmen had been confined to a protectorate of the princes. Henceforward its scope was to be enlarged, and within its fatherly embraces was to be enfolded an altruistic control over the educational and material prosperity of some two hundred millions of Indian subjects.

Three years before the mutiny another great Charter had been bestowed upon the peoples of India. The despatch of 1854 marked the first dawn of the educational, as the Queen's Proclamation marked the first dawn of the political privileges of her Indian subjects. The authors of the educational despatch, it must be assumed, did not throw their gift heedlessly upon the waters. They must have foreseen the inevitable result of their policy, and have deliberately intended to adopt the inevitable trend of their grant. England repudiated neither the despatch nor Lord Canning's establishment in 1857 of the three Universities of Calcutta, Madras and Bombay. Within twenty years of the Queen's accession England deliberately accorded India some of those gifts which she herself had acquired only after centuries of toil, of passion and of pain. From a similar ordeal she openly absolved her greatest dependency. She went further. She threw open by Parliamentary aid the Civil Service to open competition. Nomination died and was buried. The highest administrative prizes of India, it was announced, were within the grasp of any one who could pass a public examination in London. That was indeed a grave step in advance upon the close system of cadetship or of that under which young men were trained for India in the quiet of the college in leafy Hertfordshire.

This sketch, hasty and imperfect, and in the main, a summary from memory of a charming article by Sir William Hunter in the *Contemporary Review* of 1888, brings me down to 1858. It is necessary to go back awhile to trace what was the attitude of great English statesmen in years long anterior to the Queen's Proclamation towards the government of the Indian peoples. This retrospective will serve a three-fold purpose. It will show first that Englishmen whose names will live enshrined for all time in Indian history

regarded India as a trust in the hands of England for Indian ends: secondly, that they intentionally held out to the peoples of this country the hope in future years of a generous employment in the service of their own land; and, thirdly, that the Queen's Proclamation was itself only one step in the history of evolution, made possible by the openly avowed sentiments of the statesmen who governed England when the Queen herself was a girl in her teens.

When in 1833, Parliament searched deeply into Indian affairs, it was thus that the Marquis of Lansdowne spoke:

"He should be taking a very narrow view of this question, and one utterly inadequate to the great importance of the subject, which involved in it the happiness or misery of 100,000,000 of human beings, were he not to call the attention of their lordships to the bearing which this question and to the influence which this arrangement must exercise upon the future destinies of that vast mass of people. He was sure that their lordships would feel, as he indeed felt, that their only justification before God and Providence for the great and unprecedented dominion which they exercised in India was in the happiness which they communicated to the subjects under their rule, and in proving to the world at large and to the inhabitants of Hindustan that the inheritance of Akbar (the wisest and most beneficent of Mahomedan princes) had not fallen into unworthy or degenerate hands. Hence it was important that when the dominion of India was transferred from the East India Company to the King's Government they should have the benefit of the experience of the most enlightened councillors, not only on the financial condition of our empire in the East, but also on the character of its inhabitants. He stated confidently, after referring to the evidence given by persons eminently calculated to estimate what the character of the people of India was, that they must, as a first step to their improved social condition, be admitted to a larger share in the administration of their local affairs. On that point their lordships had the testimony of a series of successful experiments and the evidence of the most unexceptionable witnesses who had gone at a mature period of their life and with much natural and acquired knowledge to visit the East. Among the crowd of witnesses which he could call to the improvable condition of the Hindu character he would select only two; but those two were well calculated to form a correct judgment, and fortunately contemplated Indian society from very different points of view. Those two witnesses were Sir Thomas Munro and Bishop Heber. He could not conceive any two persons more eminently calculated to form an accurate opinion upon human character, and particularly upon that of the Hindu tribes. They were both highly distinguished for talent and integrity, yet they were placed in situations from which they might have easily come to the formation of different opinions—one of them being conversant with the affairs of the East from his childhood and familiarised by long habit with the working of the system, and the other being a refined Christian philosopher and scholar going out to the East late in life, and applying in India the knowledge which he had acquired here to form an estimate of the character of its inhabitants. He held in his hand the testimony of each of those able men, as extracted from their different published works, and with the permission of the House he would read a few words from both. Sir T. Monro, in speaking of the Hindu character, said: 'Unless we suppose that they are inferior to us in natural talent, which there is no reason to believe, it is much more likely that they will be duly qualified for their employments than Europeans for theirs—because the field of selection is so much greater in the one than in the other. We have a whole nation from which to make our choice of natives, but in order to make choice of Europeans we have only the small body of the Company's covenanted servants. No conceit more wild and absurd than this was ever engendered in the

darkest ages ; for what is in every age and every country the great stimulus to the pursuit of knowledge but the prospect of fame or wealth or power ? Or what is even the use of great attainments if they are not to be devoted to their noblest purpose, the service of the community, by employing those who possess them according to their respective qualifications in the various duties of the public administration of the country ? Our books alone will do little or nothing; dry simple literature will never improve the character of a nation. To produce this effect it must open the road to wealth and honor and public employment. Without the prospect of such reward no attainments in science will ever raise the character of a people.' That was the sound practical opinion of Sir T. Monro, founded on his experience acquired in every part of India, in every department of the public service. Bishop Heber, during his extensive journey of charity and religion through India, to which he fell at length a martyr, used these remarkable expressions : 'Of the natural disposition of the Hindu I still see abundant reason to think highly, and Mr. Bayley and Mr. Melville both agreed with me that they are constitutionally kind-hearted, industrious, sober, and peaceable ; at the same time that they show themselves on proper occasions a manly and courageous people.' And again : 'They are decidedly by nature a mild, pleasing, and intelligent race, sober, parsimonious, and, where an object is held out to them, most industrious and persevering.' Their lordships were therefore justified in coming to the same conclusion—a conclusion to which, indeed, they must come if they only considered the acts of this people in past ages—if they only looked at the monuments of gratitude and piety which they had erected to their benefactors and friends—for to India, if to any country, the observation of the poet applied :

'Sunt hic etiam sua præmia laudi,
Sunt lacrymæ rerum, et mentem mortalia tangunt.'

But, however much civilisation had been obscured in those regions, whatever inroads foreign conquest and domestic superstition had made upon their moral habits, it was undeniable that they had still materials left for improving and ameliorating their condition ; and their lordships would be remiss in the performance of the high duties which devolved upon them if they did not secure to the numerous natives of Hindustan the ample development of all their mental endowments and moral qualifications. It was a part of the new system which he had to propose to their lordships that to every office in India every native, of whatsoever caste, sect, or religion, should by law be equally admissible, and he hoped that Government would seriously endeavour to give the fullest effect to this arrangement, which would be as beneficial to the people themselves as it would be advantageous to the econmical reforms which were now in progress in different parts of India."

The other view of the question was put by Lord Ellenborough thus :

"He felt deeply interested in the prosperity of India, and when he was a Minister of the Crown, filling an office peculiarly connected with that country, he had always considered it his paramount duty to do all in his power to promote that prosperity. He was as anxious as any of his Majesty's Ministers could be to raise the moral character of the native population of India. He trusted that the time would eventually come, though he never expected to see it, when the natives of India could, with advantage to the country and with honour to themselves, fill even the highest situations there. He looked forward to the arrival of such a period, though he considered it far distant from the present day ; and he proposed, by the reduction of taxation, which was the only way to benefit the lower classes in India, to elevate them ultimately in the scale of the society, so as to fit them for admission to offices of power and trust. To attempt to precipitate the arrival of such a state of society as that he had been describing was the surest way to defeat the object in view. He never, however, looked forward to a period when all offices in India would be placed in the hands of natives. No man in his senses would propose to place the political and military power in India in the hands of the natives.

"The Marquis of Lansdowne observed that what the Government proposed was that all offices in India should be by law open to the natives of that country.

"Lord Ellenborough said such was precisely the proposition of Government, but our very existence in India depended upon the exclusion of the natives from military and political power in that country. We were there in a situation not of our own seeking, in a situation from which we could not recede without producing bloodshed from one end of India to the other. We had won the empire of India by the sword, and we must preserve it by the same means, doing at the same time everything that was consistent with our existence there for the good of the people."

I need scarcely apologise for quoting at some length Macaulay's reply to Lord Ellenborough. Macaulay's periods are the familiar property of every educated Indian. They know him by heart, and revel in the luxuriant and generous liberality of his views.

"I have detained the House so long, Sir, that I will defer what I had to say in some parts of this measure—important parts, indeed, but far less important as I think than those to which I have adverted, till we are in Committee. There is, however, one part of the Bill on which, after what has recently passed elsewhere, I feel myself irresistibly impelled to say a few words. I allude to that wise, that benevolent, that noble clause, which enacts that no Native of our Indian Empire shall, by reason of his colour, his descent, or his religion, be incapable of holding office. At the risk of being called by that nickname which is regarded as the most opprobrious of all nicknames by men of selfish hearts and contracted minds—at the risk of being called a philosopher—I must say that, to the last day of my life, I shall be proud of having been one of those who assisted in the framing of the Bill which contains that clause. We are told that the time can never come when the natives of India can be admitted to high civil and military office. We are told that this is the condition on which we hold our power. We are told that we are bound to confer on our subjects—every benefit which they are capable of enjoying?—no—but which it is in our power to confer on them?—no—but which we can confer on them without hazard to our own domination. Against that proposition I solemnly protest as inconsistent alike with sound policy and sound morality.

"I am far, very far, from wishing to proceed hastily in this most delicate matter. I feel that, for the good of India itself, the admission of Natives to high office must be effected by slow degrees. But that, when the fulness of time is come, when the interest of India requires the change, we ought to refuse to make that change lest we should endanger our own power;—this is a doctrine which I cannot think of without indignation. Governments, like men, may buy existence too dear. 'Propter vitam vivendi perdere causas,' is a despicable policy either in individuals or in states. In the present case, such a policy would be not only despicable, but absurd. The mere extent of empire is not necessarily an advantage. To many Governments it has been cumbersome; to some it has been fatal. It will be allowed by every statesmen of our time, that the prosperity of a community is made up of the prosperity of those who compose the community, and that it is the most childish ambition to covet dominion which adds to no man's comfort or security. To the great trading nation, to the great manufacturing nation, no progress which any portion of the human race can make in knowledge, in taste for the conveniences of life, or in the wealth by which those conveniences are produced, can be a matter of indifference. It is scarcely possible to calculate the benefits which we might derive from the diffusion of European civilisation among the vast population of the East. It would be, on the most selfish view of the case, far better for us that the people of India were well governed and independent of us, than ill-governed and be subject to us—that they were ruled by their own kings, but wearing our broad cloth, and

working with our cutlery, than that they were performing their salaams to English collectors and English magistrates, but were too ignorant to value, or to poor too buy English manufactures. To trade with civilised men is infinitely more profitable than to govern savages. That would indeed be a doting wisdom, which, in order that India might remain a dependency, would keep it an useless and costly dependency—which would keep a hundred millions of men from being our customers in order that they might continue to be our slaves.

It was, as Bernier tells us, the practice of the miserable tyrants, whom he found in India, when they dreaded the capacity and spirit of some distinguished subject, and yet could not venture to murder him, to administer to him a daily dose of the pousta, a preparation of opium, the effect of which was in a few months to destroy all the bodily and mental powers of the wretch who was drugged with it, and to turn him into an helpless idiot. That detestable artifice, more horrible than assassination itself, was worthy of those who, employed it. It is no model for the English nation. We shall never consent to administer the pousta to a whole community—to stupify and paralyse a great people, whom God has committed to our charge for the wretched purpose of rendering them more amenable to our control. What is that power worth which is founded on vice, on ignorance, and on misery—which we can hold only by violating the most sacred duties which as governors we owe to the governed—which as a people blessed with far more than an ordinary measure of Political liberty and of intellectual light—we owe to a race debased by three thousand years of despotism and priestcraft ? We are free, we are civilised, to little purpose, if we grudge to any portion of the human race an equal measure of freedom and civilisation.

" Are we to keep the people of India ignorant in order that we may keep them submissive ? Or do we think that we can give them knowledge without awakening ambition ? Or do we mean to awaken ambition and to provide it with no legitimate vent ? Who will answer any of these questions in the affirmative ? Yet one of them must be answered in the affirmative, by every person who maintains that we ought permanently to exclude the natives from high office. I have no fears. The path of duty is plain before us: and it is also the path of wisdom, of national prosperity, of national honour.

" The destinies of our Indian empire are covered with thick darkness. It is difficult to form any conjecture as to the fate reserved for a state which resembles no other in history, and which forms by itself a separate class of political phenomena. The laws which regulate its growth and its decay are still unknown to us. It may be that the public mind of India may expand under our system till it has outgrown that system; that by good government we may educate our subjects into a capacity for better government, that, having become instructed in European knowledge, they may, in some future age, demand European institutions. Whether such a day will ever come I know not. But never will I attempt to avert or to retard it. Whenever it comes, it will be the proudest day in English history. To have found a great people sunk in the lowest depths of slavery and superstition, to have so ruled them as to have made them desirous and capable of all the privileges of citizens would indeed be a title to glory all our own. The sceptre may pass away from us. Unforeseen accidents may derange our most profound schemes of policy. Victory may be inconstant to our arms. But there are triumphs which are followed by no reverses. There is an empire exempt from all natural causes of decay. Those triumphs are the pacific triumphs of reason over barbarism; that empire is the imperishable empire of our arts and our morals, our literature, and our law."

My. Wynn contributed as follows:

" In nothing, however, more unreservedly did he agree with the Hon. Member than in the sentiments which he so forcibly impressed on the House at the close of his speech. He had been convinced, ever since he was first connected with the affairs of India, that the only principle on which that empire could justly or wisely or advantageously be administered

was that of admitting the natives to a participation in the Government, and allowing them to hold every office the duties of which they were competent to discharge. That principle had been supported by the authority of Sir Thomas Munro, and of the ablest functionaries in India, and been resisted with no small pertinacity and prejudice! It had been urged that the natives were undeserving of trust, that no dependence could be placed on their integrity, whatever might be their talents and capacity, which no one disputed. Instances were adduced of their corruption and venality—but were they not the result of our conduct towards them! Duties of importance devolved upon them without any adequate remuneration either in rank or salary. There was no reward or promotion for fidelity; and why then complain of peculation and bribery. We made vices and then punished them; we reduced men to slavery and then reproached them with the faults of salves."

I attach the official view of Mr. Charles Grant:

"He would advert very briefly to some of the suggestions which had been offered in the course of this debate. Before doing so, he must first embrace the opportunity of expressing not what he felt, for language could not express it, but of making an attempt to convey to the House his sympathy with it in its admiration of the speech of his Hon. and learned friend the member for Leeds—a speech which, he would venture to assert, had never been exceeded within those walls for the development of statesmanlike policy and practical good sense. It exhibited all that was noble in oratory, all that was sublime, he had almost said, in poetry—all that was truly great, exalted, and virtuous in human nature. If the House at large felt a deep interest in this magnificent display it might judge of what were his emotions when he perceived in the hands of his Hon. friend the great principles he had propounded to the House, glowing with fresh colours and arrayed in all the beauty of truth.

"If one circumstance more than another could give him satisfaction it was that the main principle of this Bill had received the approbation of the House, and that the House was now legislating for India and the people of India on the great and just principle that in doing so the interests of the people of India should be principally consulted, and that all other interests of wealth, of commerce, and of revenue, should be as nothing compared with the paramount obligation imposed upon the legislature of promoting the welfare and prosperity of that great empire which Providence had placed in our hands.

Convinced as he was of the necessity of admitting Europeans to India, he would not consent to remove a single restriction on their admission unless it was consistent with the interests of the natives. Provide for their protection and then throw wide open the doors of those magnificent regions and admit British subjects there—not as aliens, not as culprits, but as friends. In spite of the differences between the two peoples, in spite of the difference of their religions, there was a sympathy which he was persuaded would unite them, and he looked forward with hope and eagerness to the rich harvest of blessing which he trusted would flow from the present measure."

Upon this debate followed the enactment [3 and 4 William IV. c. 85] "that no native of the said territories, nor any natural-born subject of His "Majesty resident therein shall, by reason only of his religion, place of birth, "descent, colour, or any of them be disabled from holding any place, office or "employment under the said Company."

In an explaining despatch the Court of Directors thus unfolded their view of this Act:—

"The Court conceive this section to mean that there shall be no governing caste in

British India; that whatever other tests of qualification may be adopted, distinction of race or religion shall not be of the number; that no subject of the King, whether of Indian or British or mixed descent, shall be excluded from the posts usually conferred on uncovenanted servants in India, or from the Covenanted Service itself, provided he be otherwise eligble."

After a lapse of twenty years, Parliament once more in 1853 revised the Company's Charter. Again I extract some of the speeches of the leading politicians:

Mr. Golbeurn said:

"Sir Thomas Munro had said, there is one great question to which we should look in all our arrangements, namely, what is to be the final result of our government on the character of the people, and whether that character will be raised or lowered. Are we to be satisfied with merely securing our power and protecting the inhabitants, leaving them to sink gradually in character lower than at present, or are we to endeavour to raise their character? It ought undoubtedly to be our aim to raise the minds of the Natives, and to take care that whenever our connection with India shall cease, it shall not appear that the only fruit of our dominion had been to leave the people more abject than when we found them. It would certainly be more desirable we should be expelled from the country altogether than that our system of government should be such an abasement of a whole people."

And thus John Bright:

"Another subject requiring close attention on the part of Parliament was the employment of the natives of India in the service of the Government. The right hon. member for Edinburgh (Mr. Macaulay), in proposing the India Bill of 1833 had dwelt on one of its clauses, which provided that neither colour nor caste nor religion nor place of birth should be a bar to the employment of persons by the Government; whereas, as matter of fact, from that time to this no person in India had been so employed who might not have been equally employed before that clause was enacted; and from the statement of the right hon. gentleman the President of the Board of Control, that it was proposed to keep up the Covenanted Service system, it was clear that this most objectionable and most offensive state of things was to continue. Mr. Cameron, a gentleman thoroughly versed in the subject, as fourth Member of Council in India, President of the Indian Law Commission, and of the Council of Education for Bengal—what did he say on this point? He said: 'The statute of 1833 made the natives of India eligible to all offices under the Company. But during the twenty years that have since elapsed not one of the natives has been appointed to any offices except such as they were eligible to before the statute."

Mr. Rich spoke as follows:

"But if the case as to the native military was a strong one, it was much stronger as to civilians. It had been admitted that ninety-five per cent. of the administration of justice was discharged by native judges. Thus they had the work, the hard work; but the places of honour and emolument were reserved for the Covenanted Service—the friends and relatives of the directors. Was it just that the whole work, heat and labour of the day, should be borne by natives and all the prizes reserved for Europeans? Was it politic to continue such a system? They might turn up the whites of their eyes and exclaim at American persistence in slavery. There the hard work was done by the negro whilst the control and enjoyment of profit and power were for the American. Was ours different in India? What did Mill lay down? European control—native agency. And what was the translation

of that? White power, black slavery. Was this just, or was it wise? Mill said it was necessary in order to obtain respect from the natives. But he (Mr. Rich had yet to learn that injustice was the parent of respect. Real respect grew out of common service, common emulation, and common rights impartially upheld. We must underpin our empire by such principles, or some fine morning it would crumble beneath our feet. So long as he had a voice in that House it should be raised in favour of admitting our native fellow-subjects in India to all places to which their abilities and conduct should entitle them to rise."

And then Monckton Milnes followed thus:

"Objectionable as he believed many parts of the Bill were, he considered this was the most objectionable portion, and from it very unhappy consequences might arise. When the natives of India heard it proclaimed that they had a right to enter the service of the Company, they would by their own intelligence and ability render themselves qualified for that service, if they only had the means of doing so. Then one of the two consequences would follow. They would either find their way into the service, or else the Company would have arrayed against them a spirit of discontent on the part of the whole people of India, the result of which it would be difficult to foresee. He did not see on what principles of justice, if they once admitted the principle of open competition, they could say to the natives of India they had not a perfect right to enter the service."

He was succeeded by Mr. J. G. Phillimore who quoted Lord William Bentinck.

"The bane of our system is not solely that the Civil Administration is entirely in the hands of foreigners, but the holders of this monoply, the patrons of these foreign agents, are those who exercise its directing power at home; that this directing power is exclusively paid by patronage and that the value of the patronage depends exactly upon the decree in which all the honours and emoluments of the state are engrossed by their clients to the exclusion of the natives. There exists in consequence, on the part of the Home Authorities, an interest in the Administration precisely similar to what formerly prevailed as to commerce, and directly opposed to the welfare of India."

Again Mr. Rich said:—

"As regarded employment in the public service, the natives were placed in a worse position by the present Bill than they were before. The intention of the Act of 1833 was to open the services to the natives; and surely now, when our Indian Empire was more secure than it was at that time, it was not wise to deviate from such a line of policy. His object was that all offices in India should be effectively opened to natives, and therefore he would not require them to come over to this country for examination, as such a condition would necessarily entail on natives of India great expense, expose them to the risk of losing caste, and thereby operate as a bar against their obtaining the advantages held out to all other of her Majesty's subjects. The course of education through which the youth of India at present went at the established colleges in that country afforded the most satisfactory proof of their efficiency for discharging the duties of office.

"This was not just or wise, and would infallibly lead to a most dangerous agitation, by which in a few years that which would now be accepted as a boon would be wrested from the Legislature as a right. They had opened the commerce of India in spite of the croakers of the day. Let them now open the posts of government to the natives, and they would have a more happy and contented people."

Lord Stanley spoke out as follows:

"He could not refrain from expressing his conviction that, in refusing to carry on

examinations in India as well as in England—a thing that was easily practicable—the Government were, in fact, negativing that which they declared to be one of the principal objects of their Bill, and confining the Civil Service, as heretofore, to Englishmen. That result was unjust, and he believed it would be most pernicious."

"Let them suppose, for instance, that instead of holding those examinations here in London, that they were to be held in Calcutta. Well, how many Englishmen would go out there—or how many would send out their sons, perhaps to spend two or three years in the country on the chance of obtaining an appointment! Nevertheless, that was exactly the course proposed to be adopted towards the natives of India."

John Bright said:

"That the motion now before the Committee involved the question which had been raised before during these discussions, but which had never been fairly met by the President of the Board of Control, namely, whether the clause in the Act of 1833, which had been so often alluded to, had not up to this time been altogether a nullity. If any doubt had been entertained with respect to the object of that clause, it would be removed by reference to the answers given by the then President of the Board of Control to the hon. Member for Montrose and to the speech of the right hon. Gentleman the present member for Edinburgh (Mr. Macaulay), in both of which it was distinctly declared that the object was to break down the barriers which were supposed to exist to the admission of the natives as well as Europeans to high offices in India. And yet there was the best authority for saying that nothing whatever had been done in consequence of that clause. He (Mr. Bright) did not know of a single case where a Native of India had been admitted to any office since that time, more distinguished or more highly paid than he would have been competent to fill had that clause been not passed."

Lastly, Mr. J. G. Philimore added:—

"He also feared that the Bill would prove delusive, and that although it professed to do justice to the natives the spirit of monopoly would still blight the hopes and break the spirits of the Indian people. While such a state of things continued India would be attached to this country by no bond of affection, but would be retained by the power of the army and the terror of the sword. He implored of the Committee not to allow such an empire to be governed in the miserable spirit of monopoly and exclusion."

In the House of Lords, Lord Monteagle spoke in favour of the inclusion of Indians in the Covenanted Service of India: and Earl Granville added "I for one, speaking individually have never felt the slightest alarm at natives well-qualified and fitted for public employments being employed in any branch of the public service in India."

Looking back impartially upon the pledges given by Parliament and comparing promise with performance, it is difficult to deny that Indians have in fact good grounds for complaint. They allege that in 1860 a committee was appointed by the Secretary of State of the following members of his own Council, Sir G. P. Willoughby, Mr. Mangles, Mr. Arbuthnot, Mr. Macnaghten, and Sir Erskine Perry, all Anglo-Indians, and that the committee reported *inter alia* as under:

We are in the first place unanimously of opinion that it is not only just, but expedient, that the natives of India shall be employed in the administration of India to a

large an extent as possible consistently with the maintenance of British supremacy, and have considered whether any increased facilities can be given in this direction.

It is true that, even at present, no positive disqualification exists. By Act 3 and 4 Wm. IV, cap. 85, sec. 87, it is enacted 'that no native of the said territories nor any natural-born subject of his Majesty resident therein shall, by reason only of his religion, place of birth, descent, colour, or any of them, be disabled from holding any place, office, or employment under the said Company.' It is obvious, therefore, that when the competitive system was adopted, it could not have been intended to exclude natives of India from the Civil Service of India.

Practically, however, they are excluded. The law declares them eligible, but the difficulties opposed to a native leaving India and residing in England for a time, are so great that, as a general rule, it is almost impossible for a native successfully to compete at the periodical examinations held in England. Were this inequality removed, we should no longer be exposed to the charge of keeping promise to the ear and breaking it to the hope.

Two modes have been suggested by which the object in view might be attained, The first is, by alloting a certain portion of the total number of appointments declared in each year to be competed for in India by natives, and by all other natural-born subjects of her Majesty resident in India. The second is to hold simultaneously two examinations, one in England and one in India, both being, as far as practicable, identical in their nature, and those who compete in both countries being finally classified in one list according to merit, by the Civil Service Commissioners. The Committee have no hesitation in giving the preference to the second scheme, as being the fairest, and the most in accordance with the principles of a general competition for a common object.

In order to aid them in carrying out a scheme of this nature, the Committee have consulted the Civil Service Commission, and, through the favour of Sir Edward Ryan, they have obtained a very able paper, in which the advantages and disadvantages of either plan are fully and lucidly discussed. They would solicit your careful consideration of this document, and will only, in conclusion, add that, in the event of either of the plans being adopted, it will be requisite to provide for the second examination of successful competitors in India, as nearly as possible resembling that now required in England. The Civil Service Commissioners do not anticipate much difficulty in arranging for this. The Committee, however are decidedly of opinion that the examination papers on which the competition is to proceed in India and England should be identical; but they think, in justice to the natives, that three colloquial Oriental languages should be added to the three modern European languages, so as to give the candidates the opportunity of selection."

This important document, Mr. Dadabhai Naoroji has openly stated in his letter last year to Lord Welby, the President of the Royal Commission on the Expenditure in India, was never published till published lately by himself. The natives of India are aware that Sir Stafford Northcote proposed a clause to fulfil partially the Statute of 1833 by providing for the admission of a small proportion of Indians into the Covenanted Civil Service: that the Duke of Argyll passed it and that Lord Salisbury approving of it, said, "One of the most serious dangers you have to guard against is the possibility of jealousy arising from the introduction of natives into the service." They have seen the Act of 1870, which granted to Indians a specific proportion of appointments in the Covenanted Civil Service, vigorously opposed by the Government of India and delayed for ten long years. They know how the Government of

India fought hard to substitute a "close native service" for the right to share in the appointments of the Covenanted Civil Service, and they know how in 1878 Lord Cranbrook put his foot down on proposals which suggested a very serious deviation from the expressed policy of successive Secretaries of State in England. Lord Cranbrook's despatch is worth quoting.

"6. Your proposal of a close native service with a limited class of high appointments attached to it, and your suggestions that the Covenanted Civil Service should no longer be open to natives, involve an application to Parliament which would have no prospect of success, and which I certainly would not undertake. Your lordship has yourself observed that no scheme would have a chance of sanction which included legislation for the purpose of repealing the clause in the Act of 1833 above quoted, and the obstacles which would be presented against any attempt to exclude natives from public competition for the Civil Service would be little less formidable."

"10. It is, therefore, quite competent to your lordship's Government to appoint every year to the Civil Service of India any such number of natives as may be determined upon, and the number of covenanted civilians sent out from this country will have to be proportionately decreased. The appointments should in the first instance be only probationary, so as to give ample time for testing the merit and ability of the candidates."

"11. It appears to me that the advantages of such a simple scheme will be obvious :—

"(i) It will undoubtedly be much more popular with the natives, as it will place them on a footing of social equality with the convenanted civilian ;

"(ii) Inasmuch as it will exclude no civilian at present in India from any office which he has a moral claim to expect, it will avoid any clashing with the vested interests of the Civil Service ;

"(iii) It will avoid the necessity of any enhancement of salaries of uncovenanted officers which is now proposed, not because such enhancement is necessary, but from the necessity of creating a class of well-paid appointments to form sufficient prizes for a close native service. And it lastly, pursues the same system of official training which has proved so eminently successful in India."

It was then that Lord Lytton made his famous declaration in a Minute which cynically confessed that the local authorities intended to burke the operation of an English statute and the repeated pledges of a Queen and her responsible ministers. "The Act of Parliament is so undefined," wrote Lord Lytton, "and indefinite. Obligations on the part of the Government of India towards its native subjects are so obviously dangerous, that no sooner was the Act passed than the Government began to devise means for practically evading the fulfilment of it. Under the terms of the Act which are studied and laid to heart by that increasing class of educated natives whose development the Government encourages, without being able to satisfy the aspirations of its existing members, every such native if once admitted to Government employment in posts previously reserved to the covenanted Service is entitled to expect and claim appointment in the fair course of promotion to the highest post in that service.

"We all know that these claims and expectations never can or will be

fulfilled. We have had to choose between prohibiting them and cheating them: and we have chosen the least straightforward course. The application to natives of the competitive examination system as conducted in England, and the recent reduction in the age at which candidates can compete, are all so many deliberate and transparent subterfuges for stultifying the Act and reducing it to a dead letter. Since I am writing confidentially I do not hesitate to say that both the Governments of England and of India appear to me, up to the present moment, unable to answer satisfactorily the charge of having taken every means in their power of breaking to the heart the words of promise they had uttered to the ear."

At last in 1880 were launched the "statutory" Civilians, and it is one of the grievances with Indians that the very name was a trespass upon the avowed intentions of those who had conceded a limited entrance to the Covenanted Service. The distinction drawn between the Covenanted and Statutory Civilians grated on the ear. It was feared that the distinctive name portended no goodwill on the part of its godfathers. At any rate it is openly asserted that after the admission of seven Indians or so as Covenanted Civilians, the Government of India schemed how best to strangle the Statutory Service. Within three years of its formation the political passions of men throughout India were raised to a white heat by the explosion of race feeling which accompanied the so-called "Ilbert" Bill. Still three years later and under the Public Service Commission, the Statutory Civilian quietly expired and on the tombstone which marks his unfrequented resting place Lord Salisbury from the House of Lords inscribed for epitaph the avowal that all England's pledges, proclamations and acts were only "Political Hypocrisy."

I have endeavoured to make three things clear: first, the gradual evolution of British policy in India; secondly, the means adopted by that policy to raise the status of the Indians; thirdly, the open and repeated promises held out by Queen and Parliament that the Indians should in time be admitted to a greater share than they possessed in the government of their native land. England had taken the peoples of India directly under her own supervision. She had opened to them avenues to learning and to knowledge. She had promised them fair treatment in life's race for life's prizes. The curriculum of education through which the Indian student passes is essentially English. He reads Mill and Macaulay, quotes Shakespeare and is inspired by Milton. The character of Hampden is held up to him for his admiration. All that is best and most ennobling in English literature is poured out before him by his teachers. He is made intimate with the passionate declamations of Sheridan and Burke. He drinks in the political oratory of Fox and Pitt, is moved by the story of

Ireland's wrongs, and thrills with the belief that he too is a sharer in the liberty of that country where freedom no longer "sits enthroned upon the heights." He quickly learns the art of criticism and is invited to express it in the form of essays. In a word, he is educated to feel and think and talk as much like an Englishman as the bounds of Nature will permit. With such antecedents and under such conditions it needed no prophet to foretell what would happen. The youth of India has imbibed only too readily all we have taught it. Can we resent the practical requests of its early and vigorous manhood?

In the year 1885, just fourteen years ago, some seventy two Indian gentlemen assembled at Bombay to consult together over the more instant political wants of their fellow-countrymen. These men were themselves the product of English civilization and culture. They were carrying out to their legitimate consequences the repeated declarations of the Paramount Power and the teachings which they had themselves absorbed under English auspices from the same fountain source whence Englishmen were inspired with dreams of freedom and self-government. Next year (1886) 412 representatives gathered together at Calcutta. The number rose in 1887 to 607 at Madras, and in 1889, curiously enough to that exact number, 1889 at Bombay. That was the year when Sir William Wedderburn presided and educated India listened to the oratorical magnetism of Charles Bradlaugh who was visiting India after a very serious illness at home. In 1890, 677 delegates assembled at Calcutta; in 1891, 812 at Nagpore; in 1892, 625 at Allahabad; in 1893, 867 at Lahore, and in 1894, at Madras 1,200, sat under the presidency of Mr. Alfred Webb, a Home Rule Member of Parliament who undoubtedly exercised a strong fascination over his hearers. In 1895, Poona welcomed 1584 delegates, in 1896, Calcutta saw 784 meet. Last year at Amraoti, the capital of the Berars, 692 delegates assembled. This year the meeting place is to be Madras where rumours of plague will probably reduce the attendance of those interested in the National Congress.

Roughly speaking, during a period of thirteen years something like 10,000 men have at their own expense travelled long distances, in one instance from a station so remote as Dehra Ismael Khan, to meet and discuss what in their opinion constituted serious and pressing questions of reform. I say nothing of the picturesque appearance presented by the throng of many hundreds of men of all colours, castes, and religions, garbed in the diverse dresses and quaint headgear of the various nationalities of India, though I have myself always felt strangely moved at this visible tribute to the spreading power of my island home. The railway and the steamboat are playing important parts in helping to remove racial ignorance and

dislike. At Allahabad I remember being greatly impressed by being asked to smoke my cigar over my early morning tea when I was one of a group of whom the others were a Brahmin from Southern India, two Parsis from Bombay, a Mahommedan from Lucknow, a Brahmosamajist from Calcutta and a Sikh from Lahore. We discussed in excellent English the reconstitution of the Legislative Councils. No one who has sat through a Congress but must have been struck with the orderliness of its proceedings, the instant obedience to the chair, the remarkable gifts of speech rising in many instances to genuine and powerful eloquence, and occasionally a readiness of debate which I have heard a competent critic declare to be not unworthy of the best traditions of the front bench of the House of Commons. The meetings are conspicuous for the earnestness which marks the members. Official opinion may disagree with some or all of the views expressed. None the less is it true that the men who are selected to speak are in the main experts in the subjects which they champion. Their utterances are entitled to weight as being the outcome of varied personal experience, gathered at the expense of much personal inconvenience and retold for the most part at the risk of much hostile and dangerous criticism. As expositions of the 'other side' of the question they are instructive; as expositions of what educated India declares her urgent needs they form the most valuable library of reference for those in whose hands lie entrusted the present welfare and the future destinies of some three hundred millions of England's subjects.

The adherents of the Congress have had to pass through much vilification and abuse. In that sense it may be truly said that their political education has been complete. It is much to their credit that they have upon the whole maintained an attitude of dignity and self-respect, and have contented themselves with the presentation of the annual report of their proceedings to the Viceroy of India. They have stood silent while the press decried their leaders as "disappointed lawyers," a criticism singularly inappropriate when of those leaders the Hon. Mr. Justice Subramania Aiyar has since become one of Her Majesty's Judges in the High Court at Madras, the Hon. Mr. Justice Budroodin Tyabji, the Hon. Mr. Justice Ranade and the Hon. Mr. Justice Telang have risen to similar positions in Bombay, while the Hon. Mr. Justice Romesh Chunder Mitter heads the list of Indian Judges of the High Court of Calcutta of whom all save the Hon. Mr. Justice Amir Ali were open and steadfast friends of the greatest and most important political movement in India since its connection with British rule. It was surely an unwise thing to belittle men like Bonnerjee and Mano Mohun Ghose of Calcutta, each of whom ranked very high in their respective lines as lawyers at the Calcutta Bar, and both of whom lent their names, their influence, their presence, and their purses to

the Indian National Congress. It has struck me as very unwise, for our Indian brethren are shrewd critics and can detect a fallacy as quickly as most men. To take shelter behind a palpable untruth is a hazardous expedient. For it not merely robs opposition of all real value, but engenders a belief that opposition is based purely on racial prejudice, a belief which I for one hold to be the most prejudicial, if not the most dangerous, to the best interests of England in this country. Pundit Ajoodianath of Allahabad, Pherozeshah Mehta of Bombay, Vijiaraghava Chari of Salem can scarcely be classified truthfully among the failures of the law. Each is or was—for the Allahabad orator, a splendid presence, is dead—a living and powerful centre of influence in his own home, and the practical politician can do few things more risky or foolish than shut his eyes to facts. However unpalatable to many Anglo-Indians may be the truth that in many walks of life, and nowhere more notably than in the Law, our Indian fellow subjects are shouldering aside their European colleagues and pushing themselves to the front, the only safe method of dealing with the new order of things is candidly to admit it and if you dislike it to recognise the principle *factum valet quod fieri non debuit.* It serves no useful purpose to talk of men like Hume and Wedderburn and Jardine as men who make it the business of their lives to disseminate sedition and provoke disorder. The people know these men. They know quite well that each ot them is in his own way a distinguished man ; and they know that each glories in the chance of birth which made each an Englishman. To libel men such as these is to create an unnecessary friction and soreness. To argument the educated Indian will listen. Abuse only hardens him.

Of the many catalogued demands of the National Congress I will deal only with a few. I know of none which are disloyal. With some I can understand disagreement. But what is there to shudder at in the petition for a re-organised Legislative Council, for the separation of the judicial from the executive function, for the creation of an Indian Military College, for a stricter economy of Indian finances, for a Simultaneous Examination for the Civil Service ? So far as the first object is concerned, the Statute of 1892 has instituted a reformed Legislative Council to which, subject to the approval of the chief authorities, members are practically elected by constituencies specially called into being by the Statute itself. In Madras for instance, two members are elected by the Southern division of the Presidency, two by the Northern, one by the University, one by the Municipality. A limited right of interpellation has been granted : the local budget is submitted for criticism. If the criticism is purely academical, and the official answers at times irritatingly vague, at any rate Parliamentary sanction has at last been accorded to a proposal which for eight years was the principal topic of the annual

debate in the National Congress. Official opposition to the demand for some real control over the finances is intelligible ; for all true power is allied with money. But Indians who have been taught that representation should always accompany taxation and whose earliest attention has been directed to Hampden's refusal to pay ship money as an example at once just and admirable, can scarcely be blamed if they seek to exercise some practical supervision over expenditure which, rightly or wrongly, they believe to be often unnecessary, extravagant and unjust. With plague and famine almost always at their doors, the leaders of the people are surely committing no crime when they seek to divert to a starving Municipality, to an extension of sanitary schemes, to the increase of hospitals and schools, to the endowment of scientific laboratories, and to kindred utilitarian improvements, monies which they see taken before their eyes and lavished without their consent upon ball rooms and swimming baths and racket-courts and tapestries for the pleasureable gratification of Governors who spend eight months out of the twelve upon the hills.

The Government of this country have repeatedly acknowledged that the separation of the executive from the judicial function is a measure which theoretically meets with their cordial approval. They plead poverty for not translating their approval into action. Educated India replies that there would be more than ample funds available for a reform which is demanded by every dictate of justice if it were itself permitted to exercise any controlling voice over taxation. What is there unreasonable or unseasonable in this prayer? No one has denounced the combination of the policeman and the judge, of the detective and the magistrate in the same person more forcibly, more openly, more continuously, than has Sir Richard Garth, the late Chief Justice of Bengal, a Privy Councillor, once Conservative member for Guildford and still an unrepentant Tory. To say that the same official, by legislation the chief of the police in the district, first helps that police to secure evidence and then proceeds to try the matter in his Magisterial capacity upon the evidence which he has assisted to prepare, is to say what is often the practice here, and is unjustifiable. Let me quote one extract from Sir Richard Garth.

"Imagine an active young magistrate, having heard of some daring robbery, which has alarmed the neighbourhood, taking counsel in the first place with the heads of the police with a view to discovering the offender. After two or three vain attempts he succeeds at last, as he firmly believes, in finding the right man ; and he then, still in concert with the police, suggests enquiries, receives information, hunts up evidence, through their agency, for the purpose of bringing home the charge to the suspected person. Having thus done his duty zealously in the first stage of the case, he next proceeds to enquire, as a Magistrate, whether the evidence, which he himself has collected, is sufficient to justify a committal. And, having come to the conclusion, not unnaturally, that it is, he afterwards, upon the self same evidence, tries the prisoner in his Judicial capacity, without the assistance of a Jury, and

convicts him. However monstrous this may appear to an English public, the picture which I have presented is by no means overdrawn.

It is not that the Indian public have any want of confidence in European officers as such. But to be tried by a man who is at once the Judge and the prosecutor is too glaring an injustice ; and it is only wonderful that a system so indefensible should have been allowed to prevail thus long under an English Government."

There has arisen—more especially in the North of India—a cry for an avenue for the employment of the sons of the Indian aristocracy in the army. Successive Viceroys, successive Secretaries of State have proclaimed a belief in the loyalty of the princes of India. There they have stopped. For these men and for the sons of men well born whose military instincts lead them to service in the army there is no outlet. To rectify this, a demand has sprung up for an institution somewhat on the lines of Sandhurst in which young India, if so minded, could receive a military education and pass to the service of the Queen by way of direct Commissions. The Queen's son, the Duke of Connaught, when serving in India, was said to have evinced considerable interest in this proposal. I may be wrong. But to me it seems that this ambition to wield a sword in England's army should be both pathetic and a matter of national pride to Englishmen. The valour of our Indian troops has frequently been eulogised. It has given practical demonstration of its existence and its potency on many a hard fought field. We are proud, and justly proud, of our Indian army. Why should we not tie more firmly to ourselves the loyalty of our chieftains and their sons by opening up to them under our own careful training and supervision new methods of cementing an alliance based upon the acknowledgment of a common interest? All around me in my own Presidency I see young men of birth and means who are carefully educated under English tutors to believe in the beliefs and excel in the pastimes which most commend themselves to Englishmen. Once released on attainment of their majority from the leading-strings of their teachers, these boys find themselves in sudden possession of very considerable inheritances with nothing on which to expend their energies, with no profession which they can follow. We teach them to live and dress and act like English gentlemen. Our training tends to cut them loose from their old customs, their old prejudices, their very relatives and friends. They are turned helpless upon the world. English society almost invariably ignores their existence, they are cultivated out of the taste for Indian usages, and they fall gradually into habits of sloth and vice and self-indulgence, human derelicts on an ocean of waste and drink and sensuality and debt. I am drawing no fanciful picture. I could place my hands on more than one sad instance of what I portray. If these young men, the gentlemen of India, were to be drafted into the army, their

education would not cease with their minority, and we should be spared the sorry spectacle of our training youth to develop only into social waifs and strays.

It would be foolish to ignore the fact that the opposition of the Indian Government and the Secretary of State to giving practical effect to the resolution of the House of Commons with regard to Simultaneous Examinations for the Civil Service has in this country aroused a deep feeling of disappointment and discontent. Great names in England have lent their sanction to such a scheme. It has been stated to be founded on justice. There is certainly nothing in it inimical to the supremacy of England. There is no doubt a so-called orthodox party in the National Congress which refuses altogether to entertain the limitation that, granted the establishment of a system of Simultaneous Examinations, the successful candidates should undergo two or three years' training in England. This attitude is due to the belief that an English training is apt to undermine Hindu traditions and observances and to replace the lost virtues by nothing which commends itself to indigenous admiration and respect. It manifested itself sharply at the Allahabad Congress of 1888. But its adherents are not formidable in number, and the trend of Indian public opinion is unquestionably in favour of an English training. Dutt in Bengal, Tagore in Bombay are representatives of Indian fitness for executive and judicial trust. When it has been fairly tried, the Indian element has not been found wanting. The fear has been openly expressed in many quarters that under the system of Simultaneous Examinations, the English lad would be distanced by the greater application of the Indian. I believe the fear to be groundless. I have enough faith in the intellectuality of my countrymen not to be afraid of the results of an equal competition. But were it otherwise, is it a fair answer in logic or ethics to a request inherently just? Nomination long ago gave way to examination in England. Are we afraid to compete on equal terms with India? Or is it that we deny the Indian the possession of qualities, moral and physical, which we believe to be a *sine qua non* for the administration of this country? I believe the latter to be the objection which weighs most seriously, if not most openly, with the opponents of Indian ambition. The closing years of the nineteenth century are witnessing a strange chapter of European advance. Before the white man the dark is falling back everywhere. Burmah has passed to the British Crown. In Africa, Europe is enlarging daily her hold upon the possession of the native tribes. Egypt is, to all intents and purposes, a British dependency. France, Germany and Belgium are consolidating their acquisitions in the dark-continent. In Natal, the Englishmen are shutting

their gates against the Indian traders. In Australia the Chinese are rigorously forbidden entrance. In far-off East, Europe is quarrelling over the inheritance of the Mongolian. In the nearer West the dismemberment of Turkey is proceeding apace and the Cresent is succumbing to the Cross. What does all this mean? Is it only that decay must yield to the forces of a resistless civilisation, or does it mean that the physical superiority of the white man is for all times and through all conditions to impose his supremacy over the black? We, at any rate in India, have taken upon ourselves responsibilities never yet assumed by any power in history. We have proclaimed that this country is a trust in our hands for its own better progress and content. On the whole, we have so far fulfilled our self-imposed obligation with splendid and unselfish good-will. From North to South we have scattered and are still scattering the seeds of a liberal education. We have exempted our Indian subjects from the centuries of slow and civil struggles through which we ourselves fought our way to freedom and to strength. Before the whole world we have repeatedly bound ourselves by solemn pledges to our Indian subjects. Do we intend to keep our faith inviolate, or are we too entering upon a course of national falsehood and deceit? Upon the answer which we ourselves can give to that question lies, in my belief, our continued and welcome hold on India.

We are permitted the privilege of our faiths. Mine may be of little value. But it is tenaciously held. Twenty years' residence in India has thrown me into constant and almost daily communication with the peoples of this Southern Presidency. Of them I speak with personal knowledge, of the other parts of India with a knowledge derived at second hand from men whom I accept as the chosen and trusted leaders of the people. My father's name and my own professional and political tendencies have brought me into close and confidential relations with all sects and classes of men from the rich and honored statesman to the humble ryot whose *puttah* to some tiny tract of sun burnt earth is all that lies between himself and starvation. If I have learnt one lesson more than another during these many years of exile and of work, it is that India accepts England's rule gladly and gratefully because she believes that the English is the justest of all the nations o the earth. I do not believe that there is any sentiment about the matter. Our rule is acceptable because it is honest. We are not loved. I see no reason why we should be. But we are admired because we are energetic, and we are trusted because we have in the main and under much temptation kept our pledges intact. It is still true that our word is our bond. And the rein lies the secret of India's willing bondage. The morality of our rule is its sanction. Educated India watches us with close and critical eyes. But

it is a mistake to suppose that our actions are appraised only by those who have partaken of our education. Each man who has come into contact with our schools and our Universities is the centre of a village circle, a circle of relations and dependents and servants by whom he is regarded as the wise man of the hour. To these he imparts the fruits of the lessons he has learnt and from him radiate into the humblest house the story of England's good work in India. It is surely unwise to tamper with this faith in our good intentions. I know more than one Englishman in India who regretted not merely as ungenerous but as unwise the spectacle of one of Her Majesty's Judges in London looking at the Queen's Proclamation of 1858 through a lawyer's spectacles in his endeavour to whittle away the solemn and beautiful utterances to which all India turns as to the great Charter of her rights. Anything which tends to impair the trust in our good faith tends to shake the stability of our empire here. So long as we are regarded as the most upright of Western nations, so long will our yoke be not unpalatable to the East. It is true that India was conquered by force. It is only true, I believe, in a restricted sense, that we hold India by the sword. The prestige of our arms is an accepted fact. But the permanence of our rule is based upon trust, not fear. To me it is a comforting faith that could India be polled to-morrow upon the choice between England and any rival European nation, the vote would be unanimous in favour of the retention of British rule. For it is not a faith according to a famous definition, "the substance of things hoped for the evidence of things unseen." It is a faith, if a faith at all, founded upon long and careful experience, the substance of things critically surveyed, the evidence of things analysed, balanced, weighed. If by disloyalty one is to understand an abundance of frank and outspoken criticism of the Executive, then India is disloyal to the core. But those who recognise in such criticism the direct result of our own teachings, must rejoice that our lessons have borne such healthy fruit and will surely prefer these unconcealed manifestations of the growth of thought to the sullen and dangerous reticence of an inaudible discontent. To one school of critics, the Indian National Congress is the embodiment of seasoned and cultured sedition. By another it is apologised for as a safety-valve. By a third it is hailed as a barometer of the people's hopes and fears, of their wishes and their wants. Which of these schools is the wisest in its day, and which is more likely to make the best use of the living encyclopædia of human information and belief? However imperfect the system of its representation, the Congress unquestionably focuses the aspirations and ambitions of those in whose interests it professes to act. It is true that as a community the Mahomedans stand aloof. This attitude may be

explained partly by the fact that educationally they are far behind their Hindu fellow-citizens and partly by the fact that in certain quarters advantage has unfortunately been taken of racial jealousy to foment them into a spirit of antagonism and mistrust. But many intelligent and well-educated Mahomedans openly sympathise with and support the Congress movement. Twice eminent Mahommedans have presided over its debates. In 1887, Mr. Budroodin Tyabji, now a High Court Judge in Bombay, was President at Madras, and again in 1896 the Honourable Mr. Sayani, a Member of the Viceroy's Legislative Council was President at Calcutta. There is little truth in the statement that the Parsees are hostile to the Congress. I have no wish to disparage the pretentions of the Parsee knight who launches such comic Bhownagharese against his Indian fellow citizens from his place in the House of Commons. I venture, however, very respectfully to suggest that those who are acquainted with the truth see no reason to subordinate to that somewhat noisy Zoroastrian the tried and capable accomplishments of such men as Mr. Dadabhai Naoroji, Mr. Dinsha Eduljee Wacha, or the Honourable Mr. Pherozeshah Mehta.

From many sources has come the criticism that the Congress desires to see imported wholesale into India the representative institutions which obtain in England. The leaders of the Congress reply, "Read our debates, let our speeches speak for themselves." The closest scrutiny of the proceedings of the Congress will disclose nothing of such a request. Parliamentary representation as it exists in England is a recognised impossibility for India. All that Congress has asked for is a far larger and more real representation in the local Legislative Councils in which it would seek a much more effective control than it possesses at present over the national expenditure. To the right of interpellation it would add the right of moving resolutions from which it is debarred under existing rules. Congress declares it has no wish to be placed in a numerical superiority in those Councils. Every scheme it has debated has always accorded an official majority to the Government. Its wish is not to outvote, but to instruct authority, and how has it been received? Lord Lansdowne paid it the compliment of describing it as the equivalent of the "forward liberal party." The Marquis of Dufferin, at a St. Andrews Banquet, denounced it and its founder, Allan Hume, in language the calumny of which still lives to arouse astonishment and indignation and despair. The leaders of the Congress were prepared to be cold-shouldered and neglected. They were not prepared for active and hostile misrepresentation at the hands of the Queen's Viceroy. It is not the duty of the chief of the state to bequeathe a legacy of ill-will to the peoples he governs. When he speaks, he speaks with the authority of high office. His public

utterances are weighed in balances sensitive to the slightest inflection. No country in the world is more easily swayed by official utterances than is India. Indian and Anglo-Indian alike hangs upon the views, expressed or deduced, of Government which are at once and eagerly followed by society at large. It is from no mere desire to revive the remembrance of old controversies that I refer to this melancholy incident in Lord Dufferin's rule. His libel is not yet forgotten. It still remains an object lesson of what a Viceroy should avoid. One Governor was sufficiently a man of the world to show courtesy to the Congress in debate. Lord Connemara invited the assemblage of 1887 to a garden party at Government House. The invitation was addressed to the "Distinguished Visitors at Madras." The Congress did not stop to quarrel with the terms of the invitation. It went *en masse*. Lord Connemara, handsome, affable, diplomatic, was shrewd in his knowledge of mankind, and no session of Congress broke up with kindlier feelings between rulers and ruled than did the session whose good will Lord Connemara purchased at the expenditure of a little social courtesy. The significance of the Congress movement may be estimated by one undeniable fact. All over India there are scattered able bodies of men who correspond to the local Bars of our provincial towns in England. In the Presidency cities these Indian *coteries* are numerically and intellectually formidable. Everywhere they are steadily increasing in numbers and in attainments. Almost all are the products of our University teaching. To a man, they are the devoted adherents of the Congress. At rare intervals, some Vakil who fancies professional preferment the more certain if he be known politically as a total abstainer propitiates the sources of favour by pretended indifference to the political activities around him. But secretly he meets his Congress colleagues in conclave and sends a private subscription to its funds which he asks shall not be acknowledged in public. There is scarcely an Indian official who is not heart and soul with the Congress. Writing of my own knowledge at first hand, many of these officials exhibit their sympathy by donations to what they regard as a common cause. When promotions of purely Indian Judges are made to the High Court Benches, the Government, however reluctantly, is compelled to take its selection from the ranks of Congressmen. It is the same in Bengal, in Madras, in Bombay, in the North-West. The truth is that no Indian of any ability but recognises that the Congress is fighting the battles of his children and his children's children. He appreciates its motives, he sympathises with its aims, he approves of its methods. The conditions of his life may prevent any overt manifestation of his view: but the leaders of the Congress are aware of his existence, and the vitality of the movement is assured by the mass of the silent but educated support which stands in

serried ranks behind its annual display. Were I a statesman and in office I should be proud of this wonderful exhibition of the development of English education. I would point with exultation to its peaceful, orderly assembly, to the discipline of its meetings, to its ready and cheerful obedience to its President, to its grateful acknowledgment of the manifold blessings of British Rule, to the sober language of its demands, to the very demands themselves, as necessary and intended results of our education, of our promises, and of our policy, and I would boast, as I believe I could boast truthfully, that no country in the world but my own could in so short a time have transformed the India of yesterday into the India of to-day. I would seek to lead, not to drive, the men who are engaged in thinking out according to their lights the grave problems connected with the necessary prosperity and continued contentment of some three hundred millions of their fellow countrymen. These men are not paid demagogues or political incendiaries with no stake in the land. Their material well-being is bound up with British Rule. They comprise, educationally, the pick and flower of all the trades and professions in India. Many of them are wealthy land-owners, nearly all of them are men of substantial means. Is it wise to decry such men as paid agitators, to denounce their leaders as discontented lawyers? In past years I was of the Cabinet of the Congress. My official severance wlth that body is now complete. But I gladly pay my old colleagues the tribute of my admiration and respect for the ability, the ardour and withal the moderation with which questions were thrashed out in the Subject Committees. It was here that all the real work of the Congress was done. For hours the specially selected debaters would meet and discuss the various topics to be submitted to the general body with a learning and enthusiasm which told of much legislative and administrative capacity. I will instance only one scene. The Councils Act of 1892 was the outcome of eight years unflagging toil. What it gave was not what was asked for. But it at least placed the seal of Parliamentary recognition and approval upon the special demand of what some one designated as the "voices crying in the wilderness." For many months before the Congress of Bombay in 1889 the various Presidencies were busy in hammering out their rival schemes. Bengal, Madras and Bombay each drafted its own report. In Madras, a large and very able Committee met week after week at my private house and embodied its recommendation in a printed paper of which its authors need never be ashamed. When the Subjects Committee assembled in Bombay under the Presidentship of Allan Hume, the debates over the rival proposals of the Presidencies lasted into the small hours of the morning. In the end, and on that particular occasion, Madras triumphed, and her scheme led in the hands of Charles Bradlaugh to that subsequent

ventilation in the House of Commons which ultimately took shape in the Act of 1892. I quote this only as an illustration. Hostile critics of the Congress are unaware of the concentration, deliberation and close scrutiny to which all questions are submitted in private before they are committed to the various speakers on the public platform of the full session of the National Congress. It is true that my personal knowledge ceases with 1894. But I have no reason to suppose that there has been any change in the procedure since.

If I were asked to single out of their many characteristics that which I considered was the most predominant trait of the men who meet annually to consider the political and other wants of their countrymen, I should be disposed to say it is their sense of pride in being subjects of Great Britain. There are who sneer at the cheers for the Queen with which each Congress closes. I know that these are felt and are the genuine outcome of an intense and lasting pride in England's greatness and goodness. I have lived too long behind the scenes and mixed too freely with the delegates not to be certain that they bear very willingly and very gratefully the yoke of England's rule. It is that knowledge which has so pained me as I have heard the latter-day cry of sedition which has culminated in legislation which many men regard as unnecessary, ungenerous and unwise. The prosecution of Tilak was in every sense of the word a mistake. The safety of England did not need the conviction of a man who is regarded by all his fellow countrymen as a martyr and by such Englishmen as know him personally as a staunch and loyal adherent of every thing that is good and sound and admirable in Great Britain's administration of India. With education constantly progressing and hungrily grasped, with fresh avenues daily opening to their ambitions, the struggle for life outside the Covenanted Services has sharpened the rivalry between our Indian subjects and ourselves. Their success, if not always achieved by methods the most scrupulous, has been sufficiently pronounced and substantial to arouse sentiments of jealousy and alarm. It would be foolish to shut one's eyes to the truth that one result of the succeeding Congresses has been to stimulate a new sense of patriotism and self-trust. This is one necessary result of our teaching. It is equally the necessary result of combination and organisation. We have taught the people to think. Can we now arrest the results of thought?

Among the weighty opinions which command attention, it appears to me, none is entitled to more consideration than the utterance of one who like Lord Cromer has passed an active portion of his official life amid those phenomena which are hourly inscribing their warnings on the wall. And this is what he has said :—

No one who watches the signs of the times in India with even moderate care can doubt that we have entered upon a period of change. The spread of education, the increasing influence of a free press, the substituting of legal for discretionary administration, the progress of Railways and Telegraphs, the easier communication with Europe, and the more ready influx of European ideas, are beginning to produce a marked effect upon the people. New ideas are springing up. New aspirations are being called forth. The power of public opinion is growing daily. Such a condition of affairs is one in which the task of Government, and especially of a despotic Government, is beset with difficulties of no light kind. To move too fast is dangerous, but to lag behind is more dangerous still. The problem is how to deal with this new-born spirit of progress, raw and superficial as in many respects it is, so as to direct it into a right course, and to derive from it all the benefits which its development is capable of ultimately conferring upon the country, and at the same time to prevent it from becoming, through blind indifference or stupid repression, a source of serious political danger. It is only what ought to be excepted by every thoughtful man that after fifty years of a free press and thirty years of expanding education, with European ideas flowing into the country on every side, and old indigenous customs, habits, and prejudices breaking down, changes should be taking place in the thoughts, the desires, and the aims of the intelligent and educated men of the country, which no wise and cautious Government can afford to disregard, and to which they must gradually adapt their system of administration, if they do not wish to see it shattered by forces which they have themselves called into being, but which they have failed to guide and control.

In 1889 Sir William Hunter who may claim high rank as an authority on Indian affairs was bold enough to say:—

I have been referred to as a moderate man. I am a moderate man. But it is not altogether pleasant for any Englishman in the midst of the political life of this country to stand on the bank and merely look on at the stream of public activity flowing past him. If I am a moderate man and abstain from politics, it is because I have proposed to myself a task which I cannot discharge if I engage in politics. The history of India has yet to be written, and when it is truly written, Englishmen will learn that the present movement is the inevitable result of causes which we ourselves have set in motion. Those who misrepresent us speak of our movement as isolated, dangerous, unimportant. But I believe this political movement in India is an indestructible part of that great awakening in India which is showing itself not only in the intellectual progress of the Indian people, but in India's commercial development and in many signs of a new national life. We have got a great force to deal with, a force which must be powerful either for the disintegration of our Indian Empire or for the consolidation of our Indian Empire; and therefore as an old official I say it is our duty to use it as a consolidating and not as a disintegrating force. The service which Mr. Yule rendered last year was one of peculiar value. It is my lot to live at some distance from London, and I have ample opportunity of hearing what people in the country say about us. The change that has taken place is very curious. Last year we were considered dangerous to the future security of the British Empire in India. It is not too much to say that during the twelve months, and in a large measure owing to Mr. Yule's exertions, to his power of calm argument, and to the dignity of his personal character, that feeling has been gradually modified, and that we are now looked upon not as dangerous, but as a class of persons who have to be watched and considered. And we are very glad to be thus watched, for we have nothing to hide. I affirm that there is no political movement in this country which is managed with the same moderation of speech and the same dignity of procedure as this, the Indian National Congress.

And in 1890 Sir William again commented as follows:—

In this very rapid survey of the effects of Western Education in India, I feel as if I had only touched the fringe of a great subject. Into the political results I am precluded, by want of space, from entering. For to deal fairly and satisfactorily with so vexed a question as the present political movements of the Indian races, would demand a detailed treatment forbidden to me here. I may therefore briefly say that those political movements are the legitimate and inevitable result of Western Education in India. The men who conduct them are the men to whom in all other respects, intellectual and moral, we are accustomed to point as the highest products of British rule in India. They are the men who form the natural interpreters of our rule to the masses of the people. To speak of such men, when their activity takes a political direction, as disaffected, would be equally unjust and untrue. For they are the men who, of all our Indian fellow-subjects, realise most clearly that their interests, present and future, are identified with the permanence of British rule.

But brief as this survey has unavoidably been, it suffices to show that the present political movements among the Indian races are only one aspect of a general advance, moral, intellectual, and industrial, that is now going on. The most significant fact connected with the late Indian National Congress at Bombay was not its marvellous assemblage of 1889 representatives from every province of India. It was rather that this great gathering for political purposes was held side by side with a still greater meeting in the same city for ameliorating the condition of Women in India—the Social Reform Conference attended by 6,000 persons, chiefly Hindus. A political movement which is purely political may be wise or unwise, but a political movement which forms part of the general advance of a people to a higher state of society and to a nobler ideal of domestic and individual life, is irresistible. It may be guided, it may be moderated, but it must assuredly be reckoned with.

Sir Charles Dilke can by no means be accounted a blind follower of Congress leaders or a partisan of Congress ambitions. Yet even he can write of the great movement in a spirit of criticism to which no wise man can take exception.

The recent attitude of the leading Anglo-Indians towards the Indian National Congress has been confused, and we gain no certain guidance from it when considered as a whole. The general position has been hostile, but some of the thoughtful men, as, for example, Sir William Wedderburn, the President of the National Congress of December 1889, have given, under the form of benevolent neutrality, a full and general approval. The high authority of Sir William Hunter has been set upon the side of approbation, and his pen has conferred upon the last three Congresses a considerable publicity—the meetings of 1885 and 1886 having passed almost unnoticed. Sir William Hunter's support outweighs much opposition. His unrivalled knowledge of India makes him a most trustworthy guide, in everything, may I say, but spelling. The attention which was excited in the United Kingdom by the Congress of December 1888 was, curiously enough, aroused by Mohammedan opposition to it. Some leading Indian Mussulmans, able to write an excellent letter of the orthodox English type, stated their views in opposition to the Congress through the most influential English journals. The result of this opposition was to attract much notice in England, which led to an examination of first principles that had not the result that the Mahomedan gentlemen intended, and a study of Sir William Hunter's letters and articles has completed the educating process. He has conclusively shown, with the calm of the historian rather than with the partial spirit of a contemporary writer, that the present native movement is the necessary outcome of the principles on which our rule of India has been based, and that it is to our interest, as much as it would be to our honour, to satisfy it in some measure.

Argument upon the matter is to be desired but not invective, and there is so much reason to think that the Congress movement really represents the cultivated intelligence of the country, that those who ridicule it do harm to the imperial interests of Great Britain, bitterly wounding and alienating men who are justified in what they do, who do it in reasonable and cautious form, and who ought to be conciliated by being met half-way. The official class themselves admit that many of the natives who attack the Congress do so to ingratiate themselves with their British rulers and to push their claims for decorations: and while I am on this point, I may add that it is an almost universal opinion among officials themselves that some of the recent appointments in the various classes of our orders have been unfortunate. Our first duty in India is that of defending the country against anarchy and invasion, with which I have dealt in the last chapter; but our other greatest duty is to learn how to live with what is commonly called the Congress movement, namely, with the development of that new India which we have ourselves created. Our past work in India has been a splendid task, splendidly performed, but there is a still nobler one before us, and one larger even than that labour on the Irish problem to which our public men on both sides seem too much inclined to give their whole attention.

I have quoted from authority whose respectability is beyond dispute. But the value of men's utterances is not measured, so far as I am concerned, by the dignity of their stations, or by the titles with which authority is pleased to ornament their names. I say nothing in disparagement of such gifts. But no wiser head or truer heart ever enlisted itself in the unselfish service of promoting Indian progress than that of the man who lived and died undecorated—*plebeius moriar senex*—yet gave without stint of the rich abundance of his experience and of the generous dictates of his beliefs for the advancement of all things tending to union and friendliness and love. I have often thought how proud my father would have been had he lived to see the practical fulfilment of what with him was something more than a day dream, the prescience of a man who was not merely a great lawyer but by instinct and experience in the true sense of the word a statesman. It will harm no man that I ask for the dead a reputation which assails no rival's claim. Forty one years ago he wrote the words with which, my offering on his distant grave, I close my long list of contributions to the validity of India's requests and of recognitions of the justice of her wants.

We are teaching the people to think: are we prepared to carry out our act to its legitimate necessary consequences? If not, far better were it, with the boldness of Lord Ellenborough, to avow at once, that the spread of education is incompatible with the maintenance of British rule in India. Shall we ignore the change? Or honestly accept it, and its responsibilities? Is there any one among us so infatuated as to dream that, after we have taught the Natives to think, they will refrain from exercising their newly-acquired power? The very charm of novelty alone would suffice to insure its exercise. We teach them principles of morality; are we infatuated enough to imagine that they are not questioning the reasoning on which we support a declaration of war against foreign States, or the appropriation of the territories of our neighbours; or that construction of old treaties which somehow ever interprets them to our own advantage? We inculcate in them the

principles of Jurisprudence; do we suppose that they cannot spy out the nakedness of our present administration of justice, and the mockery of our police? We imbue them with a knowledge of political science; shall we not expect to find them struggling to assert their political rights, urging, as they have already done, their claim to the abolition of all class privileges, demanding that all men shall stand equal before the law, requiring to be admitted to an ever-increasing share in the administration of the country, pressing their admission to political freedom, and a representative system which shall give them the hold of their own purse strings? In the old days, which are past, the people obeyed us in their ignorance because they regarded us as beings of a superior order, and crouched before us as clothed with an irresistible power. They crouched and cowered before us. *Omne ignotum pro magnifice.* But it is the tendency of familiarity to lessen wonder, even where it does not engender contempt; and we have educated people so as to enable them to judge us by a more correct standard. It is more true now, than ever, that our empire is founded upon opinion. But there is this distinction, formerly, it was a false opinion; now it is a true one: formerly opinion was the result of erroneous impressions; now it is founded upon more correct data; formerly, it was based on ignorance; now it is founded in knowledge. Those whom they took for gods, as the ancient Mexicans or Peruvians mistook Cortez Pizarro, they now find to be men like themselves; their superiors, it is true, but st l errant, fallible men. They will weigh our every act; and it behoves us well to be c rcumspect as to the quality of our every action. We must accept the truth, that the country is to be governed by us for the sake of the people, and not of ourselves. We must drop the habit of regarding ourselves as mere exiles, whose first object should be to escape from a disagreeable climate, with the greatest possible amount of the people's money, in the shortest possible time. We must look upon the land as that of our adoption; and each of us, according to his means and opportunities, must help on the welfare of the Natives, in that station of life to which it has pleased God to call him. We cannot ignore the fact of the change which our own educational measures have brought about. It remains then to accommodate ourselves to the consequences of our own policy. We must recognize the right of the Natives to political advancement, as they fit themselves for employment.

I have tried—I trust not wholly unsucessfully—to sketch the evolution which here as elsewhere is slowly creating new forces which the Imperialism of England must acknowledge and with which it must learn to cope in a spirit of large and generous discipline. I have tried to show that the India of the nineteenth century is what we have intentionally made her. In all around me I detect design. I have also tried to make clear that the programme of the Congress includes a series of reforms which are not revolutionary, still less disloyal: that these are urged by men who are the acknowledged and trusted leaders of the people, speaking earnestly and with admirable eloquence on matters with respect to which most of them are skilled experts. Under much provocation the language of these leaders has always been moderate and the leaders themselves have exhibited much self-restraint and self-respect. The movement they direct and control is full of deep and significant interest. No English statesman can afford to pass it over with contempt. The member for Cardiff was right when in the debate on the Councils Bill he designated it as the most important event in Indian history since the memorable year of 1857. We may disagree with some of the remedies proposed as impracticable,

we may dissent with some of the schemes as utopian. But no one who has honestly and intelligently followed the rise and progress of the intellectual activities which have taken shape in the National Congress but must admit the earnestness which underlies and the ability which characterises the operations of that body. It is no purpose of this paper to follow its future or to criticise its defects, but one who has tried to prove himself a friend to its energies may perhaps be permitted in all kindliness to warn its adherents against any attempted departure from the catholicity of aim and method with which for fourteen years it has worked through much difficulty and opposition and unrest for the common benefit of all men in India irrespective of colour or caste or creed. A less unselfish ambition will alienate the sympathies of the people of England and wreck a work in which the historian of the future will delight to trace the most sure as the most wonderful evidence of England's claim to the permanent respect, the ungrudging gratitude and the tender admiration of her Indian subjects.

THE ECONOMIC CONDITION OF THE PEOPLE OF INDIA.

(RAO BAHADUR R. N. MUDHOLKAR, B. A., L. L. B.)

"If a country be found possessing a most fertile soil, and capable of bearing every variety of production, and that notwithstanding, the people are in a state of extreme destitution and suffering, the chances are, there is some fundamental error in the Government of that country."—JOHN BRIGHT.

There are few subjects on which a greater diversity of opinion prevails than the economic condition of the people of this country, and hardly any, the discussion of which has aroused more anger and violent denunciation. When in one of the resolutions passed by it in 1891 the Indian National Congress laid emphasis on the great and growing poverty of the masses in India, and pointed out that a vast portion of the population were living a life of semi-starvation and such utter destitution that they succumbed on the first approach of a famine, ridicule and sneer were freely resorted to by those who disagreed with this view. Most people will remember the violent storm which arose when Mr. Hume in a rather plain-spoken letter drew attention to the grave danger to which this condition of the masses exposed the whole country and the Government. His motives and his honesty, and those of the men, who held similar views, were questioned, and it was laid down as a self-evident truth that those, who asserted that there was anything wrong in the state of the country, must be actuated by feelings of hostility to the Government and to the British nation. Such a spirit is greatly to be deprecated. The question of the actual condition of the people and the result which the administrative, industrial and social forces at work are producing upon that condition, is of too important a nature for a consideration of it to be clouded by passion, prejudice or bias. Both the Government and the people are vitally interested in it. Indeed, to the latter it is a question of life and death. It is proposed in the following few pages to examine—though very briefly—the situation and to arrive at a correct estimate of facts.

It is asserted on the one hand, that the vast bulk of the population is so poor that they cannot obtain sufficient sustenance even in ordinary years, that their condition is deteriorating, that they have become so destitute and so devoid of all staying power that they succumb on the first approach of an unfavourable season and die in hundreds of thousands and millions, that the periodically recurring famines and the disastrous results which follow from them are due mainly to this loss of staying power in the people, which

on its part is due to the prostration and dislocation of the industrial system which existed formerly in this country, that the decadence of those industries itself was brought about more by administrative acts than by natural causes, and that the system of administration and the policy of Government cause a large annual drain of the wealth of this country which is exhausting its resources and increasing its poverty.

On the other hand, it is stated that the talk about the poverty of the people of India and the exhaustion of the country is unmeaning and baseless, and that far from growing poorer the country and its people are increasing in opulence. It is confidently pointed out that population has increased, that large cities and towns have risen in place of villages, that trade has increased by leaps and bounds, new industries have sprung up, thousands of miles of railway have been laid out. The statistics of commerce, it is urged, demonstrate the immense increase in foreign trade brought about by the shipping industry (which has practically come into existence during the last hundred years) and the vast amount of bullion absorbed in this country clearly indicates that the people cannot be poor or so poor as they are said to be.

It is necessary to examine all these statements and give their proper significance and weight to the facts contained in them, before any correct or accurate estimate of the existing state of things and the nature and tendency of the forces at work can be formed. It is greatly to be pitied that those who dwell on the deficiencies and shortcomings of the existing system should have their motives questioned and their arguments met with opprobrious epithets. But the fear of misrepresentation or detraction should not prevent one from doing his duty in so important a matter.

It is an undeniable fact that British rule has conferred numerous blessings on this country. Coming in at a time when the disruptive forces at work in the last part of the 18th century had produced a state of confusion and anarchy, it has given to the people in the first place those primary requisites of civilised life—peace and order. The internal peace maintained and the protection accorded to life and property are such as India has not experienced for centuries past. Not resting merely with this great work it has established Government by Law, introduced a well-organized and superior system of administration in all its branches, created the department of public instruction, founded universities, schools and colleges, established hospitals and dispensaries, constructed railways, roads, bridges and important irrigation works and exerted actively for the increase of commerce and the development of the resources of the country. The work of England in India has in all these matters been such that her children may well be proud

of what has been accomplished. The people of India on their part are not unmindful of the vast benefits conferred upon them and are sincerely grateful for them. The greater association of the people of the country in the various departments of the administration than existed formerly, their admission to some of the privileges of British citizenship are equally appreciated and acknowledged. At the same time it is impossible to shut one's eyes to the fact that side by side with these advantages there exist many defects, short-comings, failures, lapses, which not only diminish the value of the good work done, but produce positive harm to numerous classes of the population. To obtain the full measure of the benefits conferred, and thereby to strengthen the tie which connects India with England, those defects and evils must be removed. He is no true friend of England and India who shrinks from or resents criticism directed to this end.

Endowed with a fertile soil, a good geographical situation and every variety of climate suitable for the purposes of production, possessing mineral resources of a high order, with a thrifty, sober, peaceful and industrious population, this country enjoys exceptional advantages for the creation and accumulation of wealth, and there is no reason why under favourable influences it should not acquire that pre-eminence in opulence which not only poets but historians and contemporary writers assigned to it in former times. It is said that India is already on the high road to such a pre-eminence and opulence. Large cities like Calcutta, Bombay, Madras have come into existence only during the last 150 years and have attained a high position in population, wealth, enterprize and commercial activity. Mere hamlets or insignificant towns before they came into British possession, Calcutta had, at the census of 1891, a population of 741,144 souls, Bombay of 821,764, Madras 452,518, Karachi 105,199. The yearly trade of Calcutta comes to the total amount of 72 crores of rupees, that of Bombay to nearly 66 crores of rupees, of Madras and Karachi to about 11 crores of rupees each. During 50 years the total value of the export and import trade has gone from 20 crores to 200 crores. During this period, 147 cotton spinning and weaving mills with an approximate capital of 14 crores and employing 150,000 people have come into existence. There are 29 jute mills with an approximate capital of 4 crores and giving work to 79,000 people; 71 rice cleaning mills, 68 saw-mills, 8 paper factories which between them employ 49,000 workmen; besides 63 tanneries, 51 iron foundries, 54 flour-mills, 56 oil factories and 41 tobacco factories, employing many thousands of labourers. All over the country are cotton presses and ginning factories. The coal mining industry has already made considerable advance and the total output of collieries comes to nearly $2\frac{1}{2}$ millions of tons a year.

The gold-mining industry in Mysore and the petroleum and iron mines hold out good promise. The tea, coffee and indigo industries which are of recent origin have already attained considerable proportions. In 1894-95, 10,577 vessels with a tonnage of 8,255,822 entered and cleared at ports in British India. In 1868-69 after the opening of the Suez canal, the total tonnage of vessels entered and cleared was only 4½ millions. These are, it is urged, signs not of poverty but of wealth. Then there is the extension of the railway system which began forty years ago. Over 20,000 miles of railway are already open to trafic and about 4,000 are either under construction or sanctioned.

These are facts and their importance cannot be gainsaid. How far they are indicative of wealth or even competence, so far as the children of the soil are concerned, has to be seen. Leaving Bombay and Calcutta with their palatial public and private buildings and their busy and crowded thoroughfares, if one goes into the country and sees into the squalid huts of the peasants or the labourers, or if one ventures into the poorer quarters of those big cities themselves, one cannot fail to be struck by the contrast afforded by the grinding and wide-spread poverty of the masses to these signs of apparent prosperity.

"Forty millions go through life on insufficient food" so said Sir William Hunter. Sir Charles Elliott said in a settlement report "I do not hesitate to say that half of our agricultural population (*i.e.*, over 70 millions) never know from year's end to year's end what it is to have their hunger fully satisfied." Mr. W. R. Robertson, at one time head of the Agricultural Department in Madras, said, "The condition of the agricultural labourer in India is a disgrace to any country calling itself civilised." The Director of Land Records and Agriculture, Bengal, said in 1888 "My personal opinion is that the condition of the agricultural classes in Behar including parts of Bhagalpur Division has deteriorated within the period of British rule and that it is deteriorating, while that of the population of the greater part of Bengal proper has improved." In 1888 an inquiry was made amongst some of its officers by the Government of India about the condition of the people. The opinions elicited depict a lamentable state of things. The Bengal Government stated that in Behar the labourers including petty landholders who form 40 per cent. of the population can earn a very scanty subsistence. The local officers say they can only take one full meal a day instead of two. Even the Government of India, which was inclined to take a more hopeful view of the situation than the reports of its subordinate officers justified, had to confess; "There is evidence to show that in all parts of India there is a numerous population which lives from

hand to mouth, is always in debt, does not save and has little or nothing to fall back upon in bad seasons."

The latest pronouncement on the subject is that of the Famine Commission of 1898:

"The poorer professional classes suffered severely from rise of prices, but do not come on famine relief. Beyond these classes there always has existed, and there still does exist, a lower section of the community living a hand-to-mouth existence, with a low standard of comfort and abnormally sensitive to the effects of inferior harvests and calamities of season. This section is very large, and includes the great class of day labourers and the least skilled of the artisans. So far as we have been able to form a general opinion upon a difficult question from the evidence we have heard and the statistics placed before us, the wages of these people have not risen in the last twenty years in due proportion to the rise in prices of their necessaries of life. The experience of the recent famine fails to suggest that this section of the community has shown any larger command of resources or any increased power of resistance. Far from contracting, it seems to be gradually widening, particularly in the more congested districts. Its sensitiveness or liability to succumb, instead of diminishing, is possibly becoming more accentuated, as larger and more powerful forces supervene and make their effects felt where formerly the result was determined by purely local conditions. We may take this opportunity of remarking that the evidence given before us by many witnesses proved that in times of scarcity and famine in India the rise in price of food is not accompanied by a rise in the wages of labour; on the contrary, owing to competition for the little employment available when agricultural employment falls off, the rate of wages offered and accepted is frequently below the ordinary or customary rate. Such wages in times of famine prices are not subsistence wages for a labourer with dependents to support."

The periodical recurrence of famine is a source of constant dread to the Government. The report of the Famine Commission of 1879 shows that from the beginning of the century to the period of their enquiry there were 17 famines. The loss of life from the first five which happened in the first quarter of the century is not stated; but during the last twelve, which happened during the 45 years intervening between 1833 and 1878–79, the loss of life is put down at 12,700,000. The loss of life by war in all the civilized states of the world between 1793 and 1877 is estimated by Mr. Mulhall, the statistician, at 4,500,000. In spite of the perfect internal peace which the British rule has established in India, in spite of its benevolent intentions, the great efforts and sacrifices made by it to afford relief during times of distress, three times as many people died of starvation in India during the famines of half a century, as were killed in war over the whole civilized world in one century.

At no previous time was the Government of India better prepared to cope with famine than in 1896–97. Profiting by its past experience, it had kept ready schemes of relief works, and no time was lost in devising methods or determining the organization. And yet what a heart-rending spectacle, the country afforded! Correspondents of English and Anglo-Indian papers sent to visit the scenes of distress described cases of people sinking from

exhaustion and dying by the roadside or in fields or under trees. This time at any rate it was not a case of want of grain. It was want of means to buy that grain. There was sufficient grain to feed all but there was no money to buy it.

This poverty in normal years and absence of staying power becomes intelligible when it is seen how small the average income per head of the population is. In his speech introducing the budget in 1882, Lord Cromer (then Major Baring) said that the average yearly income per head in India was Rs. 27. This estimate was based on calculations made by Sir David Barbour, and though Lord Cromer would not pledge himself to the absolute accuracy of the figure, he said it was sufficiently near the truth to show "the extreme poverty" of the masses. Mr. Dadabhai Naoroji's calculations show that the income per head is only Rs. 20. In a speech delivered by him in 1871, Mr. Grant Duff stated the income to be 2 £. This estimate was accepted as correct by Lord Mayo. The £ in those days was equal to nearly Rs. 10. Laying aside for a while the estimates of Mr. Dadabhai Naoroji and Sir M. Grant Duff and accepting the higher figure of Lord Cromer and Sir David Barbour, the income per head is hardly sufficient to meet the most necessary requirements of life. The diet of a prisoner in jail costs in average years Rs. 23¾ per head per annum. A native sepoy's diet costs Rs. 42 per head per annum. A camp follower's diet costs Rs. 30 per head per annum. Sir James Peile has calculated that the food expenses of an agriculturist in the Deccan come to Rs. 40 per head per annum. Taking the food expenses at the camp follower's scale (which is a very low scale) and to make allowance for children under twelve years of age, calculating only at three-fourths of that scale, there remain only Rs. 4 ·5 out of which have to be paid Rs. 2 ·5 for taxation of all kinds, 1 ·5 for clothing, ·5 for sundries and there remain available only annas 3 for renewal of implements and stock, accumulation of capital, provision against emergencies and for occasions of joy and sorrow.

The following statement shows the average income per head in India and other countries:—

England ...	£ 41	Scotland ...	£ 32	Ireland ...	£ 16
United Kingdom	35·2	France ...	25·7	Germany ...	18·7
Russia ...	9·9	Austria ...	16·3	Italy ...	12
Spain ...	13·8	Portugal ...	13·6	Belgium ...	22·1
Holland ...	26	Denmark ...	23·2	Sweden and Norway	16·2
Switzerland ...	16	Greece ...	11·8		
Turkey ...	4	Europe ...	18	United States	27·2
Canada ...	26·9	Australia ...	43·4		
India (according to Lord Cromer and Sir David Barbour) ...					2

The great industry in India is agriculture. The condition of the agricultural classes, however, has been a source of anxiety to Government for years past. Their growing indebtedness and the increasing transfer of land from the agricultural to the money-lending and other non-agricultural classes is considered a serious economic and administrative evil. The alarming proportions which the problem is assuming became manifest in 1874 when the ryots in several parts of the Deccan, pressed by enhanced assessments on the one hand and the demands of the money-lenders on the other, rose against the latter, maltreated their persons, deprived them of their property and destroyed the bonds and books of account evidencing their indebtedness. An influential Commission was appointed to investigate into the origin of these riots. The majority of the Commission were of opinion that among others the fiscal policy of the Government was one of the causes which produced the disturbances. The minutes of Mr. (now Sir Auckland) Colvin and Mr. Carpenter are very emphatic on the point.* In introducing the Bill for the relief of the Deccan agriculturists,† Sir Theodore Hope had to admit that "to our revenue system must in candour be ascribed some share in the indebtedness of the ryot." In the discussion which followed, Sir Robert Egerton, the Lieutenant-Governor of Punjab, pointed out that too little attention was paid to the fact of the stringency of our revenue laws having contributed to, if it did not entirely originate, the indebtedness and difficulties of the Deccan ryot. His Excellency the Viceroy Lord Lytton admitted that along with legislative measures like the bill under consideration executive action for relaxing the rigidity of the revenue system was necessary. Over twelve years later the Commission appointed to investigate into the working of the Act had to draw attention to the existence of the same rigid, fiscal system.

The gravity of the agrarian problem and the real nature of the economic situation will be made clearer by a consideration of the character of our trade with other countries, on the increase of which during this century very great stress is laid by those who deny the poverty of the people of India.

**Note.*—The following extract from Mr. Carpenter's minute deserves to be reproduced :—

"The effect which an enhancement of assessment has upon the ryot in binding him as a debtor and contracting his credit as a borrower, is unavoidable however moderate in amount and equally distributed the enhancement may be. The effect is augmented if the enhancement though not larger than the land can easily bear is still larger than could be foreseen and prepared for. It is still further augmented if the enhancement is excessive, that is, larger than the land can easily bear. Finally if the enhancement is unequally distributed, the injurious effect on individuals is intensified, and these individuals suffer the additional hardship of seeing others more fortunate than themselves."

† The Deccan Agriculturists Relief Act of 1879.

In the year 1894–95 the Export and Import trade stood thus:—

Exports including re-exports	Rx	117,139,850
Imports of merchandise, Government stores and treasure	,,	83,110,200
Excess of Exports over Imports...	,,	34,029,650

During the 55 years which intervened between 1840 and 1895 this trade stood thus:—

Years.	Imports. Rx	Exports. Rx	Excess of Exports over Imports. Rx
1840-44	10·43 Millions per year.	15·10 Millions per year.	4·67 Millions per year.
1845-49	12·51 ,,	18·32 ,,	6·11 ,,
1850-54	15·85 ,,	21·10 ,,	5·25 ,,
1855-59	26·85 ,,	26·77 ,,	·08 ,,
1860-64	41·04 ,,	44·19 ,,	3·15 ,,
1865-69	49·32 ,,	59·46 ,,	10·14 ,,
1870-74	41·60 ,,	59·43 ,,	17·83 ,,
1875-76	44,192,377	60,291,730	16,099,353
1876-77	48,876,750	65,043,789	16,167,039
1877-78	58,819,645	67,433,324	8,613,679
1878-79	44,857,342	64,919,741	20,062,399
1879-80	52,821,398	69,247,511	16,426,113
1880-81	62,104,984	76,021,042	13,916,058
1881-82	60,436,155	83,068,198	22,632,043
1882-83	65,548,868	84,527,182	18,978,314
1883-84	68,157,311	89,186,397	21,029,086
1884-85	69,591,269	85,225,922	15,634,653
1885-86	71,133,666	84,989,502	13,855,836
1886-87	72,830,670	90,190,633	17,359,963
1887-88	78,830,468	92,148,279	13,317,811
1888-89	83,285,427	98,833,879	15,548,452
1889-90	86,656,990	105,366,720	18,709,730
1890-91	93,909,856	102,350,526	8,440,670
1891-92	84,155,045	111,460,278	27,305,233
1892-93	83,275,087	113,554,399	30,279,312
1893-94	95,482,688	110,603,561	15,120,873
1894-95	83,110,200	117,139,850	34,029,650

The first thing to note is the growing character of this trade. The trade again is not confined to one country or one nation, but our commercial transactions extend all over the globe. These features, so far as they go, are satisfactory. But a most disquieting feature is that every year there is an excess of Exports over Imports and that this excess is alarmingly increasing. In 1840 this excess was 5 crores of rupees. Now it is over 34 crores a year. The imports of a country are paid by its Exports. Under

normal conditions, a country carrying on a foreign trade wishes and expects the full *commercial* value of its Exports *plus* a suitable profit over it, *i.e.*, the value of the Imports should be in excess of the value of the Exports to the extent of the profits made. The trade of India shows that far from obtaining any excess of Imports over Exports, the excess of Exports over Imports recurs year after year, and during the sixty years between 1835 and 1894–95 this excess amounted to the enormous sum of 586¼ crores for which there was no commercial return and which represents therefore the drain of her wealth from a money point of view.

The number of vessels employed in this trade was in 1894–95, 10,577 representing a tonnage of 8,255,822 which was distributed as follows:—

British	6,784,849
British Indian	288,192
Foreign	1,025,993
Indian	156,788

Nearly 80½ per cent. of the shipping trade is British or British Indian and about 1½ per cent. Indian. The following remarks of Mr. O'Conor sum up the situation very pithily:—

"The native craft employed in the foreign trade are slowly but surely disappearing."

"The shipbuilding industry in India is of the smallest dimensions."

In 1880-81 the tonnage of native Indian craft was 3 per cent. of the whole. Now it is half of that.

If we examine the goods exported and imported, it will be seen that the exports consist in the main of articles of food and raw materials for manufacture and the imports of manufactured articles. In 1894-95 the export trade consisted of:—

		Rupees.		
		Crores.		lakhs.
1.	Grain and pulse	17	,,	5
2.	Seeds	14	,,	20
3.	Jute, raw	10	,,	57½
4.	Opium	9	,,	6
5.	Cotton, raw	8	,,	70
6.	Tea	7	,,	55½
7.	Cotton yarn and cloth	7	,,	15
8.	Hides and skins	6	,,	56
9.	Indigo	4	,,	74½
10.	Jute manufactures	4	,,	21
11.	Coffee	2	,,	12¼
12.	Lac	1	,,	40

		Rupees.	
		Crores.	lakhs.
13.	Wool, raw	1 ,,	$37\frac{1}{2}$
14.	Dyes	,,	$86\frac{1}{2}$
15.	Provisions	,,	$84\frac{1}{3}$
16.	Oils	,,	$77\frac{1}{2}$
17.	Wood and timber	,,	66
18.	Sugar	,,	55
19.	Spices	,,	$51\frac{2}{3}$
20.	Silk, raw	,,	$50\frac{1}{4}$

The imported articles were :—

1.	Animals living mostly horses	,,	26
2.	Articles of food and drink ...	8 ,,	38
3.	Metals and manufactures of metals including hardware, cutlery, machinery, mill-work, railway, plant and rolling stock.	10 ,,	34
4.	Chemicals, drugs, narcotics dyeing and tanning materials	1 ,,	86
5.	Oils	2 ,,	22
6.	Raw materials and unmanufactured articles	4 ..	42
7.	Articles manufactured and partly manufactured	42 ,,	65

Among those coming under class 2 is 5 lakhs of tons of salt worth 84 lakhs of rupees.

Among those falling under class 7 are :—	Crores.	lakhs.
(*a*) Cotton twist and yarn	2 ,,	85
(*b*) Cotton piece goods little less than...	30 ,,	
(*c*) Silk goods manufactured... ...	$1\frac{1}{4}$,,	
(*d*) Woollen goods manufactured ...	$1\frac{1}{2}$,,	

Among the articles exported, tea, coffee and indigo come for nearly $14\frac{1}{2}$ crores of rupees. The trade is a valuable one but it is almost entirely owned by Europeans and the profits all belong to them and go out of the country.

The only manufactured articles exported which deserve to be noticed are cotton, yarn and cloth and jute manufactures. These are industries which have great potentialities before them and inspire hope. But even in them part of the capital is not native, the management wholly other than native, and skilled labour for the most part imported.

The textile fabrics and the articles of food, and drink imported are all capable of being produced in this country. In regard to fabrics, statistics show that of the prices of manufactured articles, only $\frac{1}{4}$ or at the most $\frac{1}{3}$ represents the cost of the raw material and three-fourths or two-thirds represents the wages of the persons engaged in manufacture, profits of manufacturers, cost of transport &c. If instead of sending raw materials to other countries and receiving the finished product from there, this country had manufactured its own raw materials, the amount representing the difference between the cost of the raw material and the price of the manufactured article would have remained all in the country and made substantial additions to the wages fund and the profits of capitalists. This yearly loss in wages and profits is estimated at from 50 to 60 crores.

Therefore, large though the volume of our foreign trade may be, and marvellous the strides which it has made during the last 75 or 100 years, there is not much reason for unmixed satisfaction. On the contrary, the growth is unhealthy and the situation abnormal and economically unsound. The articles which we import comprise almost the whole sphere of industrial activity. For articles of every day use we are dependent on foreigners. Not long ago we supplied all our wants, and from the products of our industries supplied those of other nations.

"From the earliest days, India has been a trading country. The industrial genius o her inhabitants, even more than her natural wealth and her extensive seaboard, distinguished her from other Asiatic lands. * * * The brilliant mediæval republics of Italy drew no small share of their wealth from their Indian trade. It was the hope of participating in this trade that stimulated Columbus to the discovery of America, and Da Gama to the circumnavigation of the Cape of Good Hope. Spices, drugs, dyes, and rare goods; fabrics of silk and cotton; jewels, and gold and silver—these were the temptations which allured the first adventurers from Europe."—(Hunter's India p. 555).

Again:—

"In architecture, in fabrics of cotton and silk, in goldsmith's work and jewellery, the people of India were then unsurpassed."—(*Ibid* p. 593.)

"The carving of its wood work, the patterns, colours and texture of its carpets, shawls and scarfs, admired for centuries, have, since the Great Fair of the world, been set forth as patterns for the most skilled artificers of Europe to imitate. From the looms of Dacca went forth those wonderful tissues that adorned the noblest beauties of the Court of Augustus Cæsar, bearing in the eternal city the same designation sixteen centuries ago as that by which cotton is still known in India; and the abundance of Roman coin and relics up to our time occasionally exhumed, yet preserve traces of the early commercial connection between the two most wonderful nations in the world—those of the Cæsars and the Moguls." *Notes on India* by Dr. Buist, Editor of the *Bombay Times.*)

How this industrial superiority was lost will appear from the following passage from Mill's History of India:

"It was stated in evidence that the cotton and silk goods of India up to this period (1813) could be sold for a profit in the English market at a price from 50 to 60 per cent. lower than

those fabricated in England. It consequently became necessary to protect the latter by duties of 70 and 80 per cent. on their value, or by positive prohibition. Had this not been the case, the mills of Manchester and Paisley would have been stopped at the onset and could scarcely have been set in motion even by the power of steam. They were created by the sacrifice of the Indian manufacturers. Had India been independent, she would have retaliated. This act of self-defence was not permitted her. British goods were forced on her without paying any duty, and the foreign manufacturer employed the arm of political injustice to keep down and ultimately strangle a competitor with whom he could not have contended on equal terms."

"The value of Dacca muslins" says Sir William Lee-Warner, "exported in 1787 was 30 lakhs; but in 1813 it had fallen to less than 4 lakhs."

Fettered and restricted by protective tariffs, the further decay and collapse of Indian industries was accomplished by the advance of the West in the applied sciences. Under the influence of the powers of steam and the perfection of machinery the cost of production was so diminished that the English manufacturers could undersell Indian weavers in their own country and literally drive their goods out of the market.

The one industry we have now got is agriculture. How this dependence on one single industry has proved injurious will appear from the two following quotations from the Report of the Famine Commission of 1879:—

"At the root of much of the poverty of the people of India and of the risks to which they are exposed in seasons of scarcity lies the unfortunate circumstance that agriculture forms almost the sole occupation of the mass of the population, and that no remedy for present evils can be complete, which does not include the introduction of a diversity of occupations through which the surplus population may be drawn from agricultural pursuits and led to earn the means of subsistence in manufactures or some such employments."—*The Report of the Famine Commission, Vol. II page* 175.

"A main cause of the disastrous consequences of Indian famines, and one of the greatest difficulties in the way of promoting relief in an effectual shape, is to be found in the fact that the great mass of the population directly depends on agriculture, and that there is no other industry from which any considerable part of the community derives its support. The failure of the usual rain thus deprives the labouring class, as a whole, not only of the ordinary supplies of food obtainable at prices within their reach, but also of the sole employment by which they can earn the means of procuring it. The complete remedy for this condition of things will be found only in the development of industries other than agriculture, and independent of the fluctuations of the seasons. With a population so dense as that of India, these considerations are of the greatest weight, and they are rendered still more serious by the fact that the numbers who have no other employment than agriculture are in large parts of the country greatly in excess of what is really required for the thorough cultivation of the land; so far as this is the case, the result must be that the part of the population which is in excess of the requirements of agriculture eats up the profits that would otherwise spring from the industry of the community."—The Report of the Famine Commission.

The Famine Commissioners believed that 90 per cent. of the rural population, or rather more than 80 per cent. of the total population, is already connected with the land. The writer of the exceedingly able and well informed articles on the economic situation, which appeared in the

Quarterly Journal of the Poona Sarvajanik Sabha in January and October 1890, has calculated that 86 per cent. of the entire population is so dependent, including agricultural labourers, while 7·2 per cent. only are otherwise engaged, the remaining 6·8 per cent. being employed in Government or domestic services &c. Agriculture is thus the mainstay of the people.

Now let us see how stands the case with this industry. The most striking feature with regard to it is the extraordinary extention of cultivation. In 1852-53 the cultivated area (under crop) in Madras was 9·78 millions acres. In 1894-95 it was nearly 24½ millions. In 1852-53, in Bombay it was 12·69 millions. In 1894--95 it was over 28 millions. In North-Western Provinces, the increase is from 21¼ to 25 millions. In Central Provinces it is from 11·1 millions to 16. In Berar, the increase since 1858 is over 60 per cent. Now, vast though this extension of cultivation is, it is not sufficient to meet the requirements of this country. The total area under crop was in 1894-95 a little over 196½ millions acres. The population in 1891 was over 221 millions. Making allowance for the increase in the population which must have taken place between 1891 and 1894, the cropped area would be barely three-fourth of an acre per head. Sir William Hunter calculates that at least one acre is required to keep a human being in comfort.

Then, again, the extended cultivation has been but in too many cases obtained by encroaching on grazing lands and fuel and timber reserves and by resorting to inferior and unproductive soils and is thus not all profitable economically.

The yield from land in India is not what it used to be or what it is in the advanced countries of the West. Wheat land in the North-Western Provinces which now gives only 840 lbs. an acre, yielded 1,140 lbs. in the time of Akbar (Hunter, p. 517). In India the average yield of wheat per acre is 700 lbs ; in England it is 1700 ; of cotton 60 to 70 lbs. as against 200 in America ; of rice 800 lbs. as against 2500 in Bavaria. Of agricultural stock there are not two cattle (cows, bullocks and buffaloes) per 5 acres of cultivated land. "That the agriculture of the country is in need of improvement is beyond question. The arable land is a limited factor in the case, and the population is every year getting nearer to terms of equality with it." (Material and Moral Progress Report for 1891-92, p. 277.) The main impediments to improvement are want of manure, want of cattle and want of water. (Hunter). In other words, what is wanted is capital. And capital does not flow in sufficient quantity to agriculture because of the sense of uncertainty produced by the operations of the Settlement Departments. The necessity of granting fixity of tenure and permanence to the land revenue

demand was perceived years ago and a permanent settlement was definitely promised in the despatches of 1862 and 1865. But these solemn promises have not been carried out; and even the limitations imposed by Lord Ripon with the concurrence of the Secretary of State on the ever growing enhancements of assessments are now being disregarded and set at naught.

One argument remains to be noticed, namely, the absorption of gold and silver in this country. Between 1834 and 1894–95 the net imports of gold amounted to 152 crores of rupees. Deducting out of these for

(1) Gold coin (mohurs) estimated at 3 millions,

(2) Gold reserves of exchange banks in India,

(3) What has passed out of the country as part of personal belongings, ornaments or plate unknown to trade returns,

(4) Wastage by loss and by wear and tear from year to year,

(5) Export overland into Central India which is unascertained.

There cannot be more than 120 to 125 crores of rupees worth of gold which remained with the people of this country. This gives 2 crores a year for a population of 280 millions *i.e.*, about $1\frac{1}{4}$ anna per head per year.

Similarly the net imports of silver during these 61 years were worth 361 crores. During the 60 years which elapsed before the stoppage of free coinage, 343 crores rupees worth of silver passed through the mints. Writing in 1885 Sir William Hunter estimated the silver rupees in circulation at £ 158 millions. (Hunter, p. 569). To take the circulation at £ 180 millions now would not be very wide of the mark. If we further take into account the absorption, by Central Asia, Afghanistan, Beluchistan and N. W. border tribes &c., there would not be more than 1·2 crore a year for hoarding ornaments &c., which gives less than one anna a head per year (see Mr. G. V. Joshi's paper in the Quarterly Journal of the Poona Sarvajanik Sabha for July 1888).

Even the very high estimates of Sir William Hunter which leave out of account the factors noticed by Mr. G. V. Joshi and place the absorption of the two metals between 7 and 11 millions a year, would give only between 3 annas 5 pies and 5 annas 10 pies per head per year both gold and silver. This disposes of the talk about the hoarding of the precious metals.

The situation may be shortly summed up thus:—

India has an extensive and expanding trade with all the quarters of the globe, but it is carried on for the most part by foreign, capital, with foreign labour, in foreign ships, and the children of the soil have very little share in it. The trade itself is by the excess of exports over imports indicative of a heavy and increasing annual drain which is exhausting the resources

of the country. By the dislocation and partial collapse of the old industrial system, from a manufacturing country, she has become an agricultural one. Thrown on this one industry, the pressure of the population on land has increased beyond healthy limits, and agriculture itself has ceased to be a profitable occupation. The result is " an acute, widespread, growing poverty all over the country, increasing severe distress among the lower classes and absence of economic staying power in the masses."

No amelioration of this condition is possible unless both the state and the people set themselves resolutely to correct the mistakes of the past. The excess of exports over imports represents the Home charges of the Government of India, the private remittances of its servants and the profits of foreign merchants &c. The magnitude of the Home charges and the desirability of reducing them are admitted by responsible statesmen in England. The expenditure on administration in India is also heavy beyond the means of the people. The action required in these matters is indicated thus by the Indian National Congress :—

" That the cost of the administration be greatly reduced ; in the Military branch, by a substantial reduction of the standing army, by the substitution of long termed local European troops, like those of the Hon. E. I. Company, for the present short term Imperial regiments with their heavy cost, of recruitments in England, in transport and of excessive mortality amongst non-acclimatized youths ; by the cessation of the gigantic waste of money that has gone on, now for several years, on so called Frontier defences, and by a strict economy in the Commissariat, Ordnance and Store Departments ; and in the Civil branch, by the wide substitution of a cheaper indigenous agency for the extremely costly imported Staff ; and, that measures be at once taken to give, as was promised by the British Government thirty years ago, fixity and permanence to the Land Revenue demand, and thus permit capital and labour to combine to develop the agriculture of the country, which, under the existing system of temporary settlements, in recent times often lasting for short periods, in some cases only extending to 10 and 12 years, is found to be impossible ; and to establish agricultural Banks.—(Resolution III of the Seventh Indian National Congress).

(i) As regards the machinery to control Indian Expenditure, it is prayed—(1) that the non-official Members of the Viceroy's Council may be made more directly representative of the Indian people, and that they may have the right to move amendments and divide the Council upon the provisions of the Budget ; (2) that a sufficient number of representative Indians of position and experience may be nominated to the Council of the Secretary of State on the recommendation of the elected Members of the Viceroy's and Local Legislative Council ; and (3) that each year a select Committee of the House of Commons may be appointed to inquire into and report upon the financial condition of India ;

(ii) As regards the progress of Expenditure, it is prayed that the Military and other unproductive expenditure be reduced, that larger amounts be spent in promoting the welfare and the progress of the people, and that a large saving and a more efficient administration may be obtained by the substitution, as far as practicable, of Indian for European agency in the higher grades of the Public service ; and

(iii) As regards apportionment of charges, it is prayed that the Imperial Treasury may bear a fair proportion of all expenditure in which the common interests of India and the rest of the Empire are involved ; and especially that the expenses of the present war beyond

the frontier may be largely borne by the Imperial Exchequer. Lastly, that it be an instruction to the President to submit a copy of this Resolution under his own signature to the Chairman of the Royal Commission with the least practicable delay.

—(Resolution III of the 13th Indian National Congress).

The recommendations of the Congress give expression to the conviction to which all thinking Indians and many independent Englishmen have arrived after a deep study of Indian questions. It is the old cry for justice and for peace, economy and reform. Justice as well as expediency require the adoption of a policy, which would enforce economy, husband the resources of the state, foster the development of indigenous and local arts and industries which have practically been extinguished, and help forward the introduction of modern arts and industries.

But the action of the state alone will not lift us from our present low condition. To compete with any hope of success with the activity of the progressive countries of the West, a more vivid appreciation of the changed conditions of industrial pursuits, a greater readiness to adapt ourselves to this change, a higher resourcefulness, superior powers of organization, more steady energy, better combination and united action than what we have exhibited hitherto are necessary to be manifested and put forward. Technical education in all its branches, comprising instruction both in the theory and practice of the sciences applied to industries is an absolute *sine qua non.* The highest and the best trained intellects in the country must devote themselves to the solution of the economic problem. Shall we do this? Our salvation to a certain extent at least lies in our hands.

INDIAN ASPIRATIONS UNDER BRITISH RULE.

—***—

By Romesh C. Dutt, C.I.E.,

Late officiating Commissioner of Orissa, and sometime Member of the Legislative Council of Bengal.

"I MAY suggest," said Sir Henry Fowler in June last, in reply to some remarks of Mr. Pickersgill in the House of Commons, "that if Lord Clive and Warren Hastings had had their proceedings discussed in the House on frequent occasions, and if those proceedings had been made the subject of Parliamentary inquiries, we should possibly not have had an Indian Empire."

It is not easy to understand in what sense Sir Henry Fowler used the phrase "Parliamentary inquiries." In the sense in which a student of Indian History ordinarily understands the expression, the very reverse of what Sir Henry Fowler said is the truth. It is because the proceedings of the servants of the East India Company were subjected to periodical inquiries, it is because abuses were removed and reforms were initiated periodically after such inquiries, that England has an empire in India at the present day. Sir Courtenay Ilbert, in his excellent historical Introduction to his work on the "*Government of India*" has pointed out that the entire period from 1760-1858 is "marked by Acts of Parliament occurring with one exception at regular intervals of twenty years," following on the Parliamentary stock taking upon which each renewal of the Company's Charter was conditional. It was these Parliamentary inquiries which cleansed what was impure, and strengthened what was weak, in the Company's administration, and which have materially helped in the building up of the British Empire in India.

"We have lost the salutary effect of those periodical inquiries now," I wrote last year,* "and the direct administration of India by the Crown has, along with many great and obvious advantages, this one disadvantage —that the administration is virtually responsible to none."

A friendly critic, himself an Indian administrator of high distinction,† has made some just and thoughtful remarks on my book in the January number of the *Asiatic Quarterly Review* from which I may be pardoned for making an extract.

"The key-note of the whole difficulty is sounded by Mr. Dutt when he says in his preface that 'the direct administration of India by the Crown

* "*England and India*, 1785—1885." Chatto and Windus, 1897.

† G. E. Ward, sometime Commissioner in the N. W. Provinces.

has, along with many great and obvious advantages, this one disadvantage —that the administration is virtually responsible to none.' The Government of India is a benevolent despotism; the inhabitants of India, whether of Indian or European birth, whether they are officials or non-official, have absolutely no control over its actions. For it is obvious that the British residents—even the civil and military officers of the Crown, unless they are in the Governor-General's Council—have no more voice in determining the policy of the Government than the native gentlemen, or even the native peasantry. The only power which can, and occasionally does, control the Government of India, is the British Parliament, a body which is subject to all the humours and inconstancies of the electorate of Great Britain.

* * * * *

"Is there any chance, however, of detailed reforms in Indian administration ever forming part of a party programme in Great Britain? and if there were such a chance, is it desirable that the Government of India should be guided in the details of its administration by the voice of the British public? Nothing would more tend to rivet the existing despotism upon the necks of the Indian people, while the despotism, if better intentioned, would certainly be far less intelligent that it is at present.

''No; what is wanted is that more control should be exercised in India, and by the Indian people, over their own affairs."

Most people with experience in Indian administration will be inclined to agree with Mr. Ward that (while Parliamentary inquiries at stated periods into Indian administration have been beneficial in the past, and are no less necessary in the present), the control over the every-day details of Indian administration should come, not from the electorate of Great Britian, but from the Indian people. If we calmly inquire into the true causes of that feeling of unrest, and even of some degree of bitterness between different classes, which is now observable in India, we shall find that it is really due to a policy which unwisely and ungenerously excludes the people of India from all real control over the administration, and makes them irresponsible and hostile critics instead of loyal partakers in the work of government. And if we pass in brief review some of the recent measures of the Indian Government, we shall find how much the Government have lost, even within the last year or two, in not allowing that partial control to the people of India which the people alone are fit to exercise in the management of their own concerns.

There are not many Englishmen familiar with Indian questions who approve either of the policy which led to the recent Indian Frontier War, or of the decision of the Government to charge the whole cost of that war to

the Indian revenues, while England has made a gift of nearly a million towards the expenses of the Egyptian Frontier War. Would it have been a loss or a real advantage towards a sound decision on these points if the people of India had some voice, not in ultimately deciding the questions, but in influencing by their constitutionally expressed opinion the decision of the Imperial Government? What the opinion of the people of India would have been, has been well expressed by Mr. Ward. "At the present moment the whole country is hotly debating the question not only whether the frontier policy of the Indian Government is wrong or right, but how it came about, and which party is responsible. Yet one thing is perfectly certain; that if the people of India during the last ten years had had any—the slightest—control over the taxation of the country, or the application of its revenues, the Government would have been forced either to abandon its expensive schemes of frontier defence, or to have prosecuted them under the direct sanction of Parliament at the cost of the British Exchequer."* And, we may add, the representatives of the Indian people would not have wired to the Secretary of State for India that India could do without help from England in this year of all years, and Englishmen would not have perpetrated the unspeakable injustice of charging to India the whole cost of the Indian Frontier War, while contributing to Egypt nearly a million towards the Egyptian Frontier War. A greater recognition of the popular sentiment and of popular control in the administration of India would have enabled the Indian Government to avoid a policy which has led to a needless war, or to demand from the Imperial exchequer a contribution towards the war brought about in pursuance of an Imperial policy. Neither Lord Elgin nor Sir James Westland had a right to speak for India, nor have they spoken wisely.

But let us pass on to another question which is attracting more attention at the present moment. Lord Elgin and Sir James Westland have submitted to the Secretary of State for India their proposals about the Indian Currency. The proposals are now under consideration by a Committee in this country, and we do not desire to anticipate their decision or express any opinion on their merits. But the point which we desire to urge is that the Government of India should not have made any proposals at all without consulting the people of India through their representative men and natural leaders. The point that we desire to urge is that the proposals of the Indian Government would have been sounder and wiser, and could have been urged with greater force, if they had been framed after consulting the people. The people have an interest in their currency far greater

* *Asiatic Quarterly Review*, January 1898.

than either the Government of India, responsible for the adjustment of the Indian Budget, or the European merchants and traders, having transactions in the East. All the investment which the poor people of India ever make is made, not in savings banks, but in the shape of silver jewellery for their women; and the millions of the labourers and the cultivators of India have a right to be heard, through their representatives, before a proposal is made calculated to depreciate the value of their savings made in years and generations past. The agriculturists of India are also deeply indebted to money lenders in all parts of India; and they have a right to be heard, through their representatives, before a proposal is made calculated to increase their indebtedness by artificially increasing the value of a rupee. Nothing brings into greater prominence the defect of the present method of Indian administration than the fact that a few officials, however experienced and however able, should consider themselves justified in making sweeping proposals to alter the value of the Indian Currency, without consulting the nation, whose national wealth these proposals are calculated to depreciate, and whose general indebtedness they are calculated to enhance. It would seem, from the action taken by the Indian Government, as if India existed for the convenience of the Government of India and for the convenience of foreign traders. It would seem as if the happiness of the Indian nation was a "negligible quantity," and the opinion of representative Indians was superfluous. The most impartial tribunal in the world will decide cases wrongly and unjustly if it decides them after accepting evidence on one side only; and the best and most honest Government in the world necessarily becomes selfish, unsympathetic, and unjust to the people for whom it exists, and ends by sacrificing the interests of the people to the interests of influential classes, if it refuses to grant to the people themselves some share in the control of affairs.

Let us take up another question which is also attracting much attention at the present moment. The question of constructing more railways in India from the State funds, or under guarantee of profit granted by the State, is often discussed. The question is decided in every case by the Secretary of State for India on such information as is placed before him by the Government of India. Would it be an unwise departure from this policy to consult the representatives of the people whose money is spent? The general opinion among the people of India is that, now that the great military lines have been constructed, now that the lines really required for famine protection have been laid down, the Government should not directly or indirectly make the people's money responsible for further lines. The impression is that India is not rich enough to construct those new lines which

are being multiplied from year to year; that it is an unsound, hurtful, and disastrous policy to continuously add to the national debt of India in order to construct these new lines which the people do not want, and which the country's finances do not justify. The impression is that pressure is brought to bear upon the Government by influential classes of capitalists and manufacturers for opening such new lines for serving special interests, and that the Government, with every desire to be honest and impartial, sacrifices the interests of the people, because the people are not constitutionally allowed to express and enforce their views as against the views of influential classes. The impression is (to use the words of the late Sir George Campbell, sometime Lieutenant-Governor of Bengal), that when British capitalists have put their money in losing concerns in India, people in London bully and abuse the Government of India to get the concerns taken over, and eventually they are successful. There may or may not be some truth in these impressions; but the demand that the Indian people's money should not be invested on new lines of railway in India, or on the road from Burma to China, without consulting the people's wishes, is just and reasonable. To borrow money in England to an unlimited extent to further extend the railway system in India or outside India proper, is, for the Indian Government, a policy of extravagance and of injustice to the people.

Is it necessary to further elucidate our remarks by a reference to the history of the Import Duties of India? It will be in the recollection of most Indian officials that the Government of India and the Government at home have repeatedly made "graceful concessions" to the demands of Lancashire, and have sacrificed Indian revenues, because the people of India have no constitutional power to back their Government and to resist such demands. But the end is not yet. On the 9th of this month (August), the Secretary of State for India was asked in the House of Commons to admit British manufacture in India at a further reduction of one-fourth the duty on foreign goods, after the example of Canada. Lord George Hamilton declined to do so, but the assailants have only to persist to carry their point. Neither Conservatives nor Liberals are strong enough to resist for any length of years such demands backed by twenty or thirty or forty solid votes in the House. And unless the people of India are allowed the constitutional right to stand by their Government, and to defend their national revenues and their national interests, the humiliating sight will be witnessed again and again of the British Government in India knowingly and openly sacrificing the interests of the people of India under the mandate of British voters at home.

From the question of railways and of Import duties let us turn to

another question which is engaging the attention of Indian legislators at the present moment, *viz.*, the condition of cultivators in Southern India. No question is more intimately connected with the material well-being of the people of India than that of land-administration; and the question will never be settled satisfactorily so long as representatives of the people are not allowed a constitutional method of expressing and enforcing their opinions in the matter of land settlements. An intelligent Indian landlord or publicist has often a more familiar grasp of the subject than European officials who have written reports on it all their life-time; and the proceedings of the Godavari District Conference, of which we find reports in the Indian papers recently received, show how well the representative men of Madras are fitted to take a real share in shaping and controlling land administration in that province.

The historical review of the status of the Madras cultivator given by President of the Conference is most instructive. Over forty years ago, in the Madras Administration Report of 1855-56, the Government declared that "under the *Ryotwari* system every registered holder of land is recognised as its proprietor, and pays direct to Government. He cannot be ejected by Government so long as he pays the *fixed assessment.*" In 1857 the Madras Board of Revenue stated in their report to the Government that "a Madras ryot is able to retain his land *in perpetuity without any increase of assessment*, as long as he continues to fulfil his engagements." And the Government in its review of Mr. Rickett's report wrote: "The proprietary right of a ryot is perfect, and as long as he pays the *fixed assessment on his land* he can be ousted by no one." The italics are ours; and we desire to invite attention to the fact that the assessment of the land held by the Madras ryot was considered fixed, and not liable to increase, forty years ago.

The subject received the attention of statesman like Lord Lawrence, Lord Mayo, and Lord Northbrook, Viceroys who paid more attention to improving the material condition of the people of India than to seeking a "scientific frontier" among the hills and fastnesses of Afghanistan. It was at last given a final shape by Lord Ripon, who sanctioned a modified form of permanent settlement. It was published in the settlement Manual and Standing Orders, as well as in Government Orders on the Agricultural Committee's Report, that in all districts adequately assessed, the assessment, *so far as it was based upon classification of soils and calculation of grain outturns, was permanent and unalterable;* and that revisions would be made in future settlements *only with reference to prices.*

Lastly, we come to the present policy of the Madras Government, by which, we are informed, the Government reserves to itself the right of

revising assessments, *either with reference to rise or fall in prices, or in reference to other considerations requiring re-classification of soils or re-calculation of grain returns.*

We do not pretend to any special or personal knowledge of the Madras system of settlements, and we have quoted the above statements from the proceedings of the Conference in the hope of obtaining further information on the subject. Is it a fact that in 1857 the registered Madras ryot was declared to be entitled to hold his land in perpetuity without any increase of assessment? Is it a fact that during Lord Ripon's administration, 1880-84, the Madras ryot, in adequately assessed areas, was assured that the rent payable by him was permanent and unalterable, so for as classification of soils and calculations of grain outturns were concerned? And thirdly, is it a fact that at the present day the Government of Madras have taken the power to revise rents in every recurring settlement, on the basis of reclassification of soils and re-calculation of grain returns, as well as on the rise of prices?

In Bengal, where most of the estates are owned by private landlords, every successive Act has strengthened the position of the cultivator. Lord Canning's Act of 1859 was the cultivator's *Magna Charta*; and this was revised and strengthened by the Bengal Act of 1868. Lastly came the Tenancy Act, drafted by Lord Ripon and passed by Lord Dufferin in 1885, which further extended and consolidated the rights of the Bengal cultivator. And the result of these three Acts is that the Bengal cultivator is (except in a few congested districts) a prosperous, provident, and intelligent tiller of the soil, who has adequate protection against enhancement of rents, who knows his rights and can hold his own, and who in a year of bad harvests has some resources to fall back upon, and can often avert a famine. We pause for information if the Madras cultivator, who has the Indian Government as his landlord, has similarly progressed in his rights and his material condition; or if the State landlord has gradually divested him of his rights and his resources from 1857 to 1884, and from 1884 to 1897.

In Madras, the impression is that the Government as landlord has not dealt with the cultivator fairly; that it has encroached on those rights of fixity of rent which the ryot enjoyed before. The Honorable Mr. Subba Rao pointed out in the Madras Legislative Council that the Madras Local Government had, under a misapprehension of the orders of the Secretary of State, launched upon a retrograde policy, set aside its past declarations, and endangered the security of the *Ryotwari* system of Madras. Lands are now reclassified, in violation of the pledges given by Lord Ripon's Government, and rents are enhanced on other grounds than fluctuation in prices.

The Honorable Mr. Subba Rao and the President of the Godavari District Conference may or may not be absolutely correct, but there is no doubt they represent honestly and ably the people's view on these questions; and nothing is gained and much is lost in the cause of good government in India by denying to such men a constitutional means of influencing the executive action of the Government. The thoughtful and intelligent and loyal leaders of the Indian people have a cause to represent, a right to insist upon, and the interests of the people to advocate, and nothing is gained by denying them a share of the executive power in the administration of their own concerns.

Those who decide on these matters in the dark chambers of the India Office or of the Executive Councils of India, no doubt endeavour to act with moderation, with justice, and with knowledge and ability; but it is no reflection on those high officials to state that one side of the question, the official aspect, comes more prominently to their consideration than the popular aspect; and that financial considerations demand their attention more urgently than considerations of the rights of the people. And yet there are such things as vested rights even among the unrepresented people of India and half the blunders committed in India are due to the fact that there is no one to represent them, no one to speak for them, no one to urge them, and no one to defend them, in those close offices where they are considered. No class of officials in the world are more careful, and able, and desirous to be just than high Indian officials, from the members of the Provincial and Viceregal Executive Councils to the members of the Indian Council; and yet it is a fact that the interests and rights of the people are not and cannot receive adequate and full and sufficient consideration under a system of administration under which the people are absolutely unrepresented in the offices which ultimately shape their destinies. So true is the remark of John Stuart Mill that "it is an inherent condition of human affairs that no intention, however sincere, of protecting the interests of others can make it safe or salutary to tie up their own hands."

In the interests of good administration, therefore, it is absolutely necessary to provide some means,—not for transferring to Indian hands the ultimate decision of Indian questions,—but for securing some representation of Indian opinion in those Executive Councils in England and in India which decide on great Indian questions. It would improve and strengthen Indian administration, and not weaken it, to have such men as the Hon'ble Mr. Moodeliar, the Hon'ble Mr. Subba Rao in the Madras Executive Council; to have the Hon'ble Mr. Mehta in the Bombay Executive Council; and to

have the Hon'ble the Maharaja of Darbhanga in an Executive Council formed for the Government of Bengal. And it would improve British administration in India if each Indian Province sent one member to the Viceroy's Executive Council, and one member to the Council of the Secretary of State for India. It is not an unreasonable aspiration of the people of India that five of the members of the Viceroy's Executive Council, and five of the members of the Council of the Secretary of State for India, should be sent up by the five great Provinces of India.

Side by side with this reform in the Executive Councils, a corresponding reform of the Legislative Councils is needed. Each large Province in India is divided into twenty or thirty or forty Districts, and it is not unreasonable for the people of India to hope that each District should be allowed to send one representative to the Provincial Legislative Council. The number of nominated or official members may also be increased, if necessary, and the new Councils thus constituted should meet three or four days in the week, to discuss questions relating to laws and administration, and to represent fully and adequately the wishes and sentiments and views of the people. Such really Representative Councils would bring the Government of India in real touch with the people, and would popularize and strengthen and consolidate British rule in India.

The co-operation of representative Indian members would be of great value in dealing with administrative questions, which are growing more and more difficult with the clash of contending interests. It would be a help to the Governors of the great Provinces of Bengal and the North-West, of Madras, Bombay, and the Punjab, at all times, and specially in times of distress and alarm, to have by them some men chosen from among the people to advise and help in the administration of their own concerns. It would help the Viceroy and the Secretary of State to understand better the feelings, wishes, and interests of the people, if they were in daily personal communication with representative men from the people in their Councils. It would create a bond of sympathy, which unfortunately does not exist now, between the administration and the people whose concerns are administered. It would secure an adequate and sympathetic consideration of the interests of the people, as against the interests of particular classes, in all questions coming up before the Councils. It would strengthen the Councils in local knowledge and experience, and to some extent make them broad-based on the people's will. It would remove that worst defect of British rule in India,—a defect which is more pronounced now than it was seventy years ago, in the days of Munro and Elphinstone, Malcolm and Bentinck,—the utter want of touch between the people and their rulers. And it would

substitute an intelligent and rational method of dealing with the great, loyal, and civilized population of India for a method which regards human beings as live stock, good for milking and shearing, but incapable of understanding their own interests or promoting their own well-being.

"Sedition" and "unrest" in India have attracted the attention of English administrators during the last two or three years. Will not English statesmen recognise the fact that the so-called sedition in India can only be laid to rest in the way in which it has been laid to rest in other parts of the Empire;—by reposing trust and confidence in the people, and by conceding to them some real share in the administration of their own concerns?

INDIA AND THE CURRENCY QUESTION.

—⁂—

DADABHAI NAOROJI.

Rise or fall in exchange does not in itself (other circumstances remaining the same) matter in true international trade, which adjusts itself automatically to the requirements of exchange. To establish this proposition by a detailed explanation of the mode of operations of Indian trade, I attach as Appendix A some letters which I wrote to the *Times* and the *Daily News* in 1886.

Closing the mints or introducing a gold standard does not and cannot save a single farthing to the Indian taxpayers in their remittance for "Home Charges" to this country. The reason is simple. Suppose we take roundly £ 20,000,000 sterling to be the amount of the "Home Charges." The Indian taxpayers have to send as much produce to this country as is necessary to buy £ 20,000,000, not an ounce less, no matter whatever may be the rupee or whatever the standard (gold or silver) in India. England must receive £ 20,000,000 in gold, or produce worth £ 20,000,000. The only way in which relief can come to the Indian taxpayers in these remittances is the rise in the prices of the Indian merchandise in this country, and not by any juggling with the currency laws of India.

The Government of India, in their despatch to the Secretary of State, (Simla, November 9, 1878), themselves admit this in so many words—

> "Now, it is plain that so long as the amount of the so-called tribute is not changed the quantity of merchandise necessary to pay it will not change either, excepting by reason of a change of its value in the foreign country to which it goes." (C 4868, 1886, p. 25).

Closing of the mints, and thereby raising the true rupee, worth at present about 11d. in gold, to a false rupee to be worth 16d. in gold, is a covert exaction of about 45 per cent. more taxation all round from the Indian taxpayers, and at the same time of increasing the salaries of officials and other payments in India by Government to the same extent, and giving generally the advantage to creditors over debtors, the former being generally well-to-do, and the latter the poorer classes, especially in the case of the money-lenders and the ryots.

The real and full effect of the closing of the mints must be examined by *itself*, irrespec ve of the effect of other factors. First of all, the closing

of the mints was illegal and despotic. It is a violation of all taxation Acts, by which there was always a distinct contract between the Government and the taxpayers based upon the fundamental principle of sound currency—*i.e.* of a certain definite rupee. And what is that fundamental principle upon which the currency, both of this country and of India, is based? The former is upon what is called the gold standard, and the latter the silver standard. Take the United Kingdom first.

Here the whole currency is based upon a sovereign—a fixed unit of a certain quantity of gold, whatever its relative exchangeable value may be with all other commodities. A sovereign is nothing more or less than, or anything else but, 123·274 grains of gold of a certain fineness, with a stamp upon it, certifying to the world that it is what it professes to be, and that no restriction whatsoever was to be placed either on the market of gold or on the coining of gold. Any person may present 123·274 grains of gold, of standard fineness with the mintage (which, I think, is three half-pence on an ounce),* and ask for a sovereign and will get it. It is not buying or selling gold; Government, simply having fixed a unit of currency measure, stamps the unit that it is the proper unit. I should be surprised if the Government of the United Kingdom should even think of interfering with this unrestricted sale and coinage of gold, as the foundation of the sound currency of this country. The sovereign is the standard by which every other commodity, including silver, is measured in its exchangeable value, just as a foot is a standard measure of length, a gallon, of liquid. The taxpayer's contract with the Government is that he is to pay in such unrestricted sovereigns, and every taxation law lays down the payment in such sovereigns.

Similarly about India—substitute 180 grains of standard silver, with 2 per cent. for mintage for a rupee, in place of 123·274 grains of gold, with three half-pence for every ounce of gold coined, for a sovereign, and all the above remarks apply word for word to the case of India, except that I should not be surprised at the Indian authorities playing any pranks, regardless of consequences to the Indian people, as long as they are considered favourable to the "interest," and are to be made at the cost of the Indians.

This is the true rupee—180 grains of standard silver at its market value, with nearly 4 grains more for mintage, is convertible into a rupee without any restriction either on the silver market or on the free coining of silver. It is in this true rupee that the taxpayer is legally bound to pay his taxes. Any interference with the fundamental principle and law of the rupee is illegal and unjust.

Now comes the false rupee. The true rupee, in its relation to gold at

* I understand that there is no charge now.—Coinage Act of 1870 Section 8.

the present market value of silver of 184 grains, is worth, say, about 11d. of gold. Government intervenes, abuses its power or duty to coin silver unrestrictedly, makes the rupee scarce and false, and forces it up to the value of 16d. of gold, or about 269 grains of silver (including mintage), which the rupee does not contain. And the taxpayer is compelled, by what Mr. Gladstone called "the argument and law of force," to pay his tax in this false rupee, under the false pretence of using the word "rupee" when this "rupee" is not one rupee, but nearly one and a-half rupee.

Let us now take the factor of closing the mints by *itself*. Suppose I go into the market with my produce to buy 184 grains of standard silver for which I am asked one maund of rice. I go to the mint and ask to coin this into a rupee which I have to pay to the Sircar for my tax. If I get the rupee, then it is all right. But no, the mint refuses to coin. It virtually tells me, "Bring 269 grains of silver (*i.e.*, worth 16d. of gold) and you will get a rupee." I go into the market to get the rupee. The man who has the rupee tells me, "If you give me 269 grains of silver, or as much produce as would buy 269 grains of silver, I would give you the rupee." What alternative remains for me but to give as much of my rice, about 1½ maunds, to get this false "rupee," instead of only one maund to get the true rupee which I can get in the *same market* and at the *same time*? This is altogether independent of whatever the *actual* price of commodities may be.

If the actual price of rice does not show this fall, owing to the disguise of the false "rupee," it is not that the closing of the mints has not produced this decline, but that other fortunate factors have influenced the price, whose benefit is robbed away from me by the Government by the covert device of the closing of the mints. Otherwise I would have received so much higher price for my produce than the actual price. The loss, therefore, to me is all the same, as I was forced to pay in my produce for 269 grains of silver to get the false "rupee" instead of at the *same moment* paying for 184 grains of silver to get the true rupee. These two different prices in merchandise for the false and the true rupee are demanded, as I have said above, at the *same time*, and in the same market, *i.e.*, the price of the false rupee, 45 per cent. higher than that of the true rupee, entirely irrespective of any general market rise or fall of price at any same time. If the actual price of rice be 1½ maunds for the false rupee, the price at the *same time* will be one maund for the true rupee, or for 184 grains of silver.

To test this in another way. Let us take some commodity in the country itself upon which the factor of the closing of the mints produces its full effect in the actual market, and which is not materially affected by other commercial factors, which operate generally upon the general merchandise.

Such a commodity in India is gold. It is affected, not in merely foreign exchange or international relations, but in *India itself* as a commodity, like every other commodity. Say I have a sovereign, and I want to sell it for rupees in India itself—not for exchange to foreign parts. If the "rupee" were the honest, true rupee of the market value of 184 grains of silver, I should get 22 such rupees for my sovereign, but at the false value of the "rupee," *i.e.*, the market value of 269 grains of silver, I actually get only 15 "rupees." This is the actual price of gold in India, a decline in the proportion of the false inflation of the false "rupee." This is the case with every commodity, as can be tested by offering produce for the true rupee of 184 grains of silver, and for the false rupee or 269 grains of silver at the *same time* and in the *same market*.

In addition to the higher taxation thus inflicted on the Indian taxpayers, by an irony of fate, the very "interests," (bankers, merchants, planters, foreign capitalists of all kinds, &c.) for whose behalf, besides that of Government itself, all this dislocation of currency was made, are now loudest in their cry for all the mischief caused also to them, and yet the authorities in both countries remain blind and infatuated enough not to learn even by experience, and persist in a mischievous course.

In the Treasury letter of 24th November, 1879 (C. 4868, 1886, p. 31) to the India Office, my Lords say :—

"1. The proposal appears to be open to those objections to a token currency which have long been recognised by all civilised nations, *viz.*, That instead of being automatic, it must be 'managed' by the Government, and that any such management not only fails to keep a token currency at par, but exposes the Government which undertakes it to very serious difficulties and temptations.

"2. It appears to my Lords, that the Government of India, in making the present proposal, lay themselves open to the same criticisms as are made upon Governments which have depreciated their currencies. In general, the object of such Governments has been to diminish the amount they have to pay to their creditors. In the present case, the object of the Indian Government appears to be 'to *increase the amount they have to receive from their taxpayers*. My Lords fail to see any real difference in the character of the two transactions.

" . . . . If, on the other hand, it is the case that the value of the rupee has fallen in India, and that it will be raised in India by the operation of the proposed plan, that plan is open to the objection that *it alters every contract and every fixed payment* in India.

"This proposal is, in fact, contrary to the essential and well

established principle of the currency law of this country, which regards the current standard coin as a piece of a given metal of a certain weight and fineness, and which condemns as futile and mischievous every attempt to go behind this simple definition.

"It is perfectly true as stated in the despatch (paragraph 41), that the "very essence of all laws relating to the currency has been to give fixity to the standard of value as far as it is possible," but it is no less true that, according to the principles which govern our currency system, the best and surest way, and, indeed, the only tried and known way, of giving this fixity is to adhere to the above definition of current standard coin. A pound is a given quantity of gold, a rupee is a given quantity of silver; and any attempt to give those terms a different meaning is condemned by experience and authority.

"3. If the present state of exchange be due to the depreciation of silver, the Government scheme, if it succeeds, may relieve:

(1) The Indian Government from the inconvenience of a nominal re-adjustment of taxation in order to meet the loss by exchange on the home remittances:

(2) Civil servants and other Englishmen who are serving or working in India, and who desire to remit money to England:

(3) Englishmen who have money placed or invested in India which they wish to remit to England. *But this relief will be given at the expense of the Indian taxpayer*, and with the effect of increasing every debt or fixed payment in India, including debts due by *ryots to money-lenders*; while its effect will be materially qualified, so far as the Government are concerned, by *the enhancement of the public obligations in India, which have been contracted on a silver basis*. . . . .

"If, then, a case has been made out, which my Lords do not admit, for an alteration of the currency law of India, the particular alteration which the Government of India propose, could not, in the opinion of the Treasury, be entertained until the doubts and objections which have suggested themselves to my Lords are answered and removed. These objections are founded on principles which have been long and ably discussed, and which are now generally admitted by statesmen and by writers of accepted authority to lie at the root of the currency system.

"It is no light matter to accept innovations which must sap and undermine that system, and my Lords have therefore felt it their duty plainly—though they hope not inconsistently with the respect due to the Government of India—to express their conviction that the plan

which had been referred to them for their observations is one which *ought not to be sanctioned* by Her Majesty's Government or by the Secretary of State." (Italics are mine.)

Can condemnation be more complete and convincing?

The introduction of a gold standard, while it will not save a single farthing or a single ounce of produce to the Indian taxpayer in his payment of "Home Charges," as already explained, will simply add more to his already existing grievous burdens to the extent of the heavy cost of the alteration, and injure him, Heaven knows, in what other ways, as the events of the past five years have shown.

The whole basis of the action of the Government is, and was, the assumption that, as fall in exchange will necessitate increased burden of taxation, the closing of the mints and introduction of a gold standard will save the Indian taxpayer from any such additional burden of taxation which would otherwise arise enormously in the remittance of "Home Charges," and that it is imperatively necessary to establish a stable ratio between gold and silver. That the anxiety of the Government about increased burdens of taxation and its political dangers, and that to save the people from the former and the Government from the latter, were the professed motives of all the present currency laws, would be clear from Government's own despatches.

In order not to encumber the statement here with the extracts from those despatches, I give them as Appendix B.

Both these objects, *viz.*, saving people from additional taxation, and thereby Government from political danger, by the present proposals, and past currency legislation, are pure delusions. The Government might as well have tried to stop the action of gravitation, as to try against a natural law, that while gold and silver should fluctuate in value in relation to and like all other commodities, yet between themselves they could be made to keep up a fixed ratio, or to try to make a rupee which may be only worth 11d. or even 6d. of gold, become worth 16d. of gold, unless Government have found the philosopher's stone or have attained the divine power of creating something out of nothing.

It is not that the Government of India did not know this, or were not told this from the highest authority and others, and in distinct and emphatic terms. Of this I have already given extracts from the despatch of the Treasury of November 24, 1879.

Notwithstanding the clear and emphatic views of the Treasury expressing "their conviction that the plan which had been referred to them for their observations is one which *ought not to be sanctioned by Her Majesty's*

Government, or by the Secretary of State," the Government of India and the India Office again opened the subject in another form.

Lord Randolph Churchill wrote to the Treasury on January 26, 1886, and forwarded on March 17, 1 886, a letter from the Government of India dated February 2, 1886 (c. 4868, 1886, pp. 3-5). To avoid repetition, I would not take extracts from these letters, as the reply of the Treasury embodies their views.

This reply of the Treasury is dated May 31, 1886 (signed Henry H. Fowler) :—

> "As a result of this review of the inconveniences caused by the depression in the value of silver, the Government of India express their opinion . . . . Yet there remains one thing which is not beyond the possibility of human control, and that is 'the establishment of a fixed ratio between gold and silver.' The proposition thus stated as an undoubted axiom is, however, one of the most disputable and disputed points in economic science. My Lords may, in passing, compare with this statement the declaration recorded by Mr. Goschen, Mr. Gibbs, and Sir Thomas Seccombe as the representatives of Her Majesty's Government at the International Monetary Conference of 1878, that 'the establishment of a fixed ratio between gold and silver was utterly impracticable."

"The Indian Government further express their belief (paragraph 7) that it is possible to 'secure a stable ratio between gold and silver,' and that 'a serious responsibility will rest both on the Government of India and on Her Majesty's Government if they neglect any legitimate means to bring about this result.' It would, however, have been more satisfactory if the Indian Government had undertaken to explain the grounds of their confidence that a stable ratio between gold and silver can be established, and the methods by which this is to be accomplished." . . . . .

"8. In December, 1878, Lord Cranbrook, then Secretary of State for India, forwarded to the then Chancellor of the Exchequer (Sir Stafford Northcote), without any expression of opinion, two despatches from the Government of India, containing certain proposed remedies for the evils arising out of the depression in the value of silver which were then in full force. In the only one of those despatches to which reference need here be made, after *unfavourable* reference to previous suggestions—(1) that a gold standard and gold currency should be introduced into India; and (2) that the weight of silver in the rupee should be increased, it was proposed to limit the free coinage of silver at the Indian mints. The intention of this change was to introduce into India a gold standard, while retaining its native silver currency, the ratio between the currency unit (the rupee) and

the standard (the sovereign) being fixed arbitrarily by the Goverument. The means for attaining this end are worked out in the despatch with great elaboration of detail." (Italics are mine.)

9. "This despatch and its proposals were submitted by Lord Cranbrook, on behalf of the Indian Government, and Sir Stafford Northcote, as Chancellor of the Exchequer, to a Committee consisting of Sir Louis Mallet, Mr. Edward Stanhope, M.P., Sir Thomas Seccombe, Mr. (now Sir Thomas) Farrer, Mr. (now Sir Reginald) Welby, Mr. Giffen, and Mr. Arthur Balfour, M.P. These gentlemen reported on the 30th April, 1879—'That having examined the proposals contained in the despatch, they were unanimously of opinion that they could not recommend them for the sanction of Her Majesty's Government."

"Subsequently, on the 24th November, 1879, the Treasury replied in detail to the proposals of the Indian Government. In the first part of that letter, which summarises the case as stated in the despatch, I am to call the particular attention of the Secretary of State to the following passages, which seem to apply with equal force to the present situation :—

"'My Lords need not point out that a change of the Currency Laws is one of the most difficult tasks which a Government can undertake, and that it is most unadvisable to legislate hastily and under the influence of the pressure of the moment, or of an apprehension of uncertain consequences upon a subject so complicated in itself and so important to every individual of the community, in its bearing upon the transactions and obligations of daily life.

"'It is not proved that increase or re-adjustment of taxation must necessarily be the consequence of matters remaining as they are, for nothing is said about reduction of expenditure, and equilibrium between income and expenditure may be regained by economy of expenditure as well as by increase of taxation. Further, the cost of increase of salaries may be met, or at least reduced by a careful revision of establishments. . . .

"'A perusal of the despatch leads to the conclusion that the Government of India are especially anxious to put an end to the competition of silver against their own bills as a means of remittance to India. But my Lords must ask whether this would be more than a transfer of their own burden to other shoulders; If so, who would eventually bear the loss, and what would be the effect on the credit of the Government and on the commerce of India.'"

The letter then further quotes the paragraphs, which I have already

given before, pointing out that the relief wished for by the Government "will be given at the expense of the Indian taxpayer."

"The Treasury find no reason stated in the despatch of the Government of India in the present year, which induces them to dissent from the conclusions thus sent forth on the authority of Sir Stafford Northcote as to the results of any attempt artificially to enhance the gold price of silver. . . . .

. . . . It has been the policy of this country to emancipate commercial transactions as far as possible from legal control, and to impose no unnecessary restrictions upon the interchange of commodities. To fix the relative value of gold and silver by law would be to enter upon a course directly at variance with this principle, and would be regarded as an arbitrary interference with a natural law, not justified by any present necessity.

" . . . . The observation of the Treasury in 1879, 'that nothing is said about reduction of expenditure,' seems to apply still more strongly to the existing situation, and it may be safely concluded that the control of its expenditure is far more within the reach of a Government than is the regulation of the market value of the precious metals" (c. 4868, 1886, p. 12).

Before proceeding further, I may in passing point out that in 1876 the Government of India itself was against their present proposals, and as the Lords of the Treasury say, they have urged no sound reason to alter those views. I have not got the Government of India's despatch of 1876, but I quote from that of November 9, 1878 (c. 4886, p. 18.)

"3. The despatch above referred to (October 13, 1876) discussed in some detail . . . . The general result, however, was to point out that the adoption of a gold standard with a gold currency that should replace the existing silver would be so costly as to be impracticable, and would otherwise be open to objection; . . . .

"4. The despatch notices also, *but only to reject it*, the proposal that the Indian standard of value, and with it the exchange value of the rupee, might be raised by limiting the coining of silver in the future, and by adopting a gold standard without a gold currency." (The italics are mine.)

The Government of India, in their reply, February 9, 1877, to a resolution of the Bengal Chamber of Commerce passed by them on July 15, 1876, said:—

"The value of no substance can serve as a standard measure of value unless its use as the material of legal tender currency is freely admitted. If, therefore, the free coinage of silver on fixed conditions were

disallowed inIndia, silver would no longer be the standard of value of India, but another standard would be substituted, namely, the monopoly value of the existing stock of rupees tempered by any additions made to it by the Government or illicitly. If no such conditions were made, the value of the rupee will gradually but surely rise."

"The stamp of a properly regulated mint, such as the Indian Mints, adds nothing except the costs of manufacture and seigniorage to the value of the metal on which it is impressed, but only certifies to its weight and purity."

"A sound system of currency must be automatic or self-regulating. No civilised Government can undertake to determine from time to time by how much the legal-tender currency should be increased or decreased, nor would it be justified in leaving the community without a fixed metallic standard of value even for a short time. It is a mistake to suppose that any European nation has rejected silver as a standard of value without substituting gold." (c. 706011, 1893, p. 337. Petition of the Indian Association to the House of Commons.)

And yet the Government forgot its "civilisation" and its "sound system," and inflicted upon poor India the penalty of its folly by the troubles of the past five years, and what is worse still, they want to persist in the same mischief.

Reverting to the above replies of the Treasury. After such complete condemnation by the Treasury of the proposals of the Government of India, the Indian authorities fought shy of the Treasury, and, after inditing a meaningless despatch to keep up appearances, left the Treasury severely alone, as far as I know, and adopted their own usual means to have their own way to rush into their own foregone, crude and thoughtless legislation. The only wonder is that the Committee of 1893, while knowing all this, and seeing all the pitfalls and serious consequences of the proposals, allowed the Indian Government to have their own way, in the face of the emphatic rejection by the Treasury of these proposals.

To me, the proceedings of the Indian authorities is nothing surprising. Whenever they make up their mind to do a thing they would do it—be the opposition what it may—be it of Parliament itself. Resolutions or statutes of Parliament, or condemnation by the Treasury, are to them nothing. The usual process in such cases is to appoint a Commission or a Committee, put in Members and have witnesses of their own choice, leaving, if possible, just a small margin for appearance of independence. Generally, they get their own foregone conclusions. If by some happy chance the Commission decided anything against their view, so much the worse for the Commission. The

Report is pigeon-holed, never to see the light of day, or to ignore such part as is not agreeable. If thwarted (as in this instance by the Treasury), the Government keep quiet for a time, wait for more favourable opportunities and are at it again, taking better care against another mishap.

Thus they took their own usual course, which has, as was clearly predicted at the time, launched us on the present sea of troubles.

What is stranger still, is that after the Treasury so distinctly condemned these proposals, they did not care to see that any contemplated rash and crude legislation was not inflicted on the Indian taxpayers. The fact seems to be that India is the vile body upon which any quacks may perform any vivisection, and try any cruel, crude, or rash experiments. What matters what is done to it? The Treasury, *i.e.*, the English taxpayer, has not to suffer in any way. India can be forced to pay everything.

The next natural question is—Why is it that fall in exchange should cause grievous troubles to India and not to any other self-governing, silver using country? What is the real disease which creates all the never-ceasing pains of India? The reply is given by Lord Salisbury in four words "India must be bled" under a system of "political hypocrisy."

I shall let the authorities themselves speak about the real cause of India's troubles. Lord Salisbury's view I have given above. The following extracts explain this view more explicitly and how it is effected. First, Lord Salisbury has explained that "the injury is exaggerated in the case of India, where so much of the revenue is exported without a direct equivalent."

And the literature of this very controversy itself supplied a clear explanation. Lord Randolph Churchill, as Secretary of State for India, explains how the "bleeding" and the drain of revenue is effected, and indicates also the final retribution—just as Lord Salisbury does, as already quoted by me. Lord Randolph Churchill in his despatch to the Treasury of January 26, 1886 (4, 868,) 1886 p. 4, says:—first—

> "It need hardly be said that it is in consequence of the large *obligatory payments* which the Government of India has to make in England in gold currency that the fall in the exchange value of the rupee affects the public finances." (Italics are mine.)

And next he hits the nail on the head, and gives concisely and unmistakeably the real evil from which all India's woes flow.

> He says:—"The position of India in relation to taxation and the sources of the public revenues is very peculiar, not merely from the habits of the people, and their strong aversion to change, which is more specially exhibited to new forms of taxation, but likewise *from the character of the Government which is in the hands of foreigners who hold*

all the principal administrative offices and form so large a part of the army. The impatience of new taxation, which would have to be borne *wholly as a consequence of the foreign rule imposed on the country, and virtually to meet addition to charges arising outside of the country*, would constitute a *political danger*, the real magnitude of which, it is to be feared, is not at all appreciated by persons who have no knowledge of, or concern in, the Government of India, but which those responsible for that Government have long regarded as of the most serious order." (The italics are mine.)

"Here, then, is the real disease—*the character of the Government, which s in the hands of foreigners*, who hold all the principal administrative offices, and form so large a part of the army" "the taxation which would have to be borne *wholly, as a consequence of the foreign rule* imposed on the country, and virtually to meet additions to charges arising outside of the country."

And it is remarkable that this was prophesied more than a hundred years ago by the highest Indian authority of the day.

Sir John Shore, in his famous minute in 1787 (Parliamentary Return 377 of 1812, para. 132), says:

"Whatever allowance we may make for the increased industry of the subjects of the State, owing to the enhanced demand for the produce of it (supposing the demand to be enhanced) there is reason to conclude that the benefits are more than counterbalanced by *evils inseparable from the system of a remote foreign dominion*." (Italics are mine.)

These *evils of the system of a remote foreign dominion* must be faced by the British rulers before it is "too late."

Now, with regard to the immediate position—What is to be done now? Retrace the false step of 1893, taken in spite of the clear warnings of the Treasury and others, and against the "law of Nature." The opening of the mints to the unrestricted coining of silver will correct all the mischievous results that have flowed from the closing of the mints. And further, the true remedy, as pointed out by the Treasury, is a reduction of expenditure and re-adjustment of establishments.

It never occurs to the Indian authorities in both countries that the high salaries of officials may be reduced, say a third, and as repeatedly urged by many a right-thinking man—native agency should be substituted, except for the highest control—for the foreign agency—and that Britain should contribute its fair share of the expenditure, to the extent to which such expenditure is incurred for *its own purposes* and *benefits*, such as the European services and Imperial wars, &c. Of course, anybody can understand that it is hard for officials to cut their own salaries, and let the Indians to come by their own or ask the British people to contribute a fair share. But this is the

only remedy both for the preservation of English rule and for the prosperity of both England and India.

The opening of the mints will have immediate important effects. (1) The stringency of the money market and the consequent dislocation of trade will be remedied. (2) The poor taxpayer will have to submit to such additional taxation only (after careful and earnest reduction of expenditure and avoiding of suicidal and unnecessary wars) as will be absolutely necessary to meet the deficit caused by the natural fall of exchange, instead of a concealed enormous enhancement of the *whole* taxation of the country, under the disguise and by the creation of a false "rupee" by closing the mints, to the extent of the difference between the value of the true and false rupee (may be between 6d. and 16d., or nearly three times as much.)

The Indian authorities must take the advice which the Treasury has given and restore the currency law to its original purity and soundness.

The second proposal for a gold standard (with partial or full quantity of gold) must be abandoned. The Government of India have themselves condemned the proposal, as already stated. What does it mean? It is most inopportune at present. It means that all the proportionate small quantity of silver that is in British India, and the proportionately large quantity that is in the native States, must be forcibly (not by any natural economic cause but by the despotism of the State) deprived of a large portion of its present value by throwing a large quantity of it in the market, and buy large quantity of gold at a still higher proportion of value by the large additional demand created by it. All this loss in cheapening silver and dearer gold to be sqeezed out of the poor, wretched famished ryot of India.

The conversion of silver into gold standard, cannot be carried out without great cost which will be the highest cruelty and tyranny to inflict upon the "bloodless" and miserable and helpless people of India, and especially this infliction to be made on the false assumption that it will give relief from the burden of the remittances for "Home Charges," when it will do nothing of the kind, as stated by Government itself.

The step is not at all necessary for any economic purpose except that it will be a convenience to the foreign exploiter, official and non-official. A gold currency, without gold and with an unrestricted silver currency is a delusion rejected by Government itself, and forcibly impressed by the Treasury.

The proposal to introduce a gold currency into India is based on the argument that it would save all present loss to the people of India from the fall in exchange. It will do nothing of the kind. It will simply inflict greater loss and hardship on the wretched Indian taxpayer. I explain.

The Indian taxpayer, at the time when exchange was 2s. per rupee, was sending produce to England worth 16 crores of rupees to meet the payment of £ 16,000,000. Now, taking exchange, say roundly 1s. per rupee he has to send produce worth 38 crores of rupees to meet the (present) remittance of £19,000,000—or at a double rate. To avoid the confusion of ideas that prevails through the present controversy, I would eliminate silver altogether from the problem and put it in another form—that when one rupee was equal to 2s. the Indian taxpayer sent, say, one million tons of produce to meet the £ 19,000,000 of Home charges—when a rupee is 1s. he has to send two million tons of produce to meet the same demand. Whether the currency be gold or silver or copper or lead will not be of the slightest consequence. The Indian taxpayer will have to send to this country as much produce, and not one ounce less, as would purchase £ 19, 000,000—the only difference in the quantity of produce to be sent will depend solely on the rise or fall in gold. Only there will be on the poor taxpayer this additional infliction—that he will be saddled with the heavy cost of the conversion of the currency in gold; and gold becoming so much more in demand will still further rise, and the taxpayer will have to send so much more produce to meet the additional rise in the value of gold. All talk of saving to the Indian the present loss by fall in exchange is pure imagination.

Again, suppose a ryot is paying Rs. 10 as land tax. When gold currency is introduced, what will Government take from him in place of Rs. 10? Will Government demand at the supposed rate of 1s. per rupee—*i.e.*, ten shillings only—or will Government demand arbitrarily in its despotic power at the rate of the fictitious value of a rupee as two shillings and will take £1, or any amount at any higher rate above the intrinsic value of the rupee? Taking the gross revenue comprehensively, the total gross revenue is Rs. 850,000,000, what will Government take from the taxpayer when gold currency is introduced? Will it take at the present supposed rate of 1s. per rupee, *viz.*, £ 42,500,000, or will it arbitrarily impose a double revenue at the rate of 2s. per rupee, so that from his present poor produce the taxpayer must sell double the produce to meet the demands of Government. If the latter, what a precious benefit will this be to the Indian taxpayer from the gold currency!

When gold currency is introduced what salary will be paid to the European official? Suppose he has a salary of Rs. 1,000 per month, will Government give him at the rate of 1s. per rupee, *i.e.*, £ 50, and will the official accept £ 50 for the Rs. 1,000? Is not all the present strong agitation of the Anglo-Indian a clear reply that he will do nothing of the kind, but will continue his agitation till he gets £100 or something near it

for his Rs. 1,000; or in other words get his salary doubled at a stroke, at the expense of the starving ryot? And has not Government already shown that it will yield to such agitation, and will be readily "liberal" to European demands at the sacrifice of the Indians? It has already yielded to the demands of the uncovenanted Europeans and has given them a fixed exchange of 1s. 9d. per rupee for their furlough, no matter whether exchange is 1s. or even less, say 6d. Now the whole European service is agitating to get them 1s. 9d. or some other high fixed exchange, even to the extent of half their salary. Do these Anglo-Indians really want to exact from the starving ryot such high exchange when the rupee is worth perhaps a shilling or even sixpence? Who will pay this difference? Of course an arbitrary Government may oppress a people as much as they like, but will the British people and Parliament allow such a thing?

On the top of all this comes the merchant with his agitation for the gold currency, that he may be saved, at the sacrifice of the ryot, from his risks of trade. The profits of trade are for his pocket, but risks of a commercial disturbance must be met by the ryot! The poverty-stricken ryot must protect the well-to-do-trader! Gold save India!

I do not need to trouble the reader with any further remarks as to the effect of the introduction of a gold currency on the condition of the people who according to Lord Lawrence's testimony, are living on scanty subsistence, and who, according to Lord Cromer, are already "extremely poor." Our friends, the Anglo-Indians have to bear in mind that they are taking already from the mouths of the poor Indian about Rs. 150,000,000 or more every year as salaries, allowances, pensions, &c., to the so-much deprivation of the provision of the children of the soil. Will they never understand or consider this and what evil that means to India?

The Government of the United Kingdom dare not play such pranks with the taxpayers. In India the Government only thinks of the foreign "interests" (official and non-official) first, and of the subjects afterwards, if it ever thinks of the subjects at all when foreign "interests" are concerned.

Lord Mayo has truly said: "I have only one object in all I do. I believe we have not done our duty to the people of the land. Millions have been spent on the conquering race, which might have been spent in enriching and in elevating the children of the soil. We have done much, but we can do a great deal more. It is, however, impossible, unless we spend less on the 'interests' and more on the people."

On another occasion he said: "We must take into account the inhabitants of the country—the welfare of the people of India is our primary object. If we are not here for their good, we ought not to be

here at all."—Sir W. Hunter's "Life of Mayo."

This is exactly the whole truth. It is the "interests" alone that the present selfish system and spirit of Government care for—and though that is some profit to England, it is most destructive to India. If, according to the noble words of Lord Mayo, the *people's* true welfare were made the object, England itself will be vastly more benefited than it is at present, and India will also be benefited and will bless the name of England, instead of cursing it as she now begins to do—shut your eyes to it as much as you like. Do as Lord Mayo says, and all difficulties of trade, taxation, finances, currency amine, plague, unnecessary wars, and last, but not least, of *poverty* and *disaffection* will vanish. The past has been bad. "bleeding, and degrading"—let the future be good yet—prospering and elevating. India then will be quite able to pay as much as may be necessary for healthy government, and *all necessary* progress.

In the above remarkable and true words of Lord Mayo, you have the cause of all India's woes and evils, and all England's political dangers of "the most serious order," as well as the proper remedy for them.

APPENDIX A.—INDIAN EXCHANGES.

From the Times, September 9, 1886.

Sir,—I hope you will kindly allow me to make a few observations upon Indian exchanges. I shall first describe the mode of operation of an export transaction from India. In order to trace the effect of the exchange only, I take all other circumstances to remain the same—*i.e.*, any other circumstances, such as of supply and demand, &c., which affect prices.

I take an illustration in its simplest form. Suppose I lay out Rs. 10,000 to export 100 bales of cotton to England. I then calculate, taking exchange into consideration, what price in England will enable me to get back my Rs. 10,000, together with a fair profit—say, 10 per cent.—making altogether Rs. 11,000. Suppose I take exchange at 2s. per rupee, and find that 6d. per lb. will bring back to me in remittance as much silver as would make up Rs. 11,000, I then instruct my agent in England to sell with a limit of 6d. per lb., and to remit the proceeds in silver, this being the simplest form of the transaction. The result of the transaction, if it turned out as intended, will be that the cotton sold at 6d. per lb. will bring back to me Rs. 11,000, and the transaction will be completed.

Now I take a transaction when exchange is 1s. 4d. instead of 2s. per rupee. I lay out Rs. 10,000 for 100 bales of cotton, all other circumstances remaining the same, I calculate that I can get back my Rs. 10,000, and 10 per cent. profit, or Rs. 11,000 altogether, if my cotton were sold at 4d. per lb. Then I instruct my agent for a limit of 4d., which, being obtained, and silver being remitted to me at the reduced price, I get back my Rs. 11,000.

The impression of many persons seems to be that, just as I received 6d. per pound when exchange was 2s. per rupee, I get 6d. also when exchange is only 1s. 4d. per rupee, and that, silver being so much lower, I actually get Rs. 16,500, instead of only Rs. 11,000. This, however, is not the actual state of the case, as I have explained above. When exchange is at 2s. per rupee, and I get 6d. per lb. for my cotton, I do not get 6d. per lb. when exchange is only 1s. 4d. per rupee, but I get only 4d. per lb.; in either case the whole operation is that I laid out 10,000 and received back Rs. 11,000. When exchange is 2s. I get 6d. of gold; when exchange is 1s. 4d. I do not get 6d. of gold but 4d. of gold making my return of silver, at the lower price, of the same amount in either case—viz., Rs. 11,000.

I explain the same phenomenon in another form, to show that such alone is the case, and no other is possible. Supposing that according to the impression of many, my cotton could be sold at 6d. per lb. when exchange is only 1s 4d.—that is to say, that I can receive Rs. 16,500 back for my lay-out of Rs. 10,000, why my neighbour would be only too glad to undersell me and be satisfied with 40 per cent. profit in place of my 50 per cent. profit, and another will be but too happy and satisfied with 20 per cent., and so on till, with the usual competition, the price will come down to the natural and usual level of profits.

The fact is no merchant in his senses ever dreams that he would get the same price of 6d. per lb. irrespective of the exchange being either 2s. or 1s. 4d. Like freight, insurance, and other charges, he takes into consideration the rate of exchange, and settles at what price his cotton should be sold in order that he should get back his lay-out with the usual profit. This is what he expects, and he gains more or less according as the state of the market is affected by other causes, such as larger supply or demand, or further variation in exchange during the pendency of the transaction.

Taking, therefore, all other circumstances to remain the same, and the exchange remaining the same during the period of the completion of the transaction, the effect of the difference in the exchange at any two different rates is that when exchange is lower you get so much less gold in proportion, so that in the completion of the transaction you get back in either case your cost and usual profit. In the cases I have supposed above, when exchange is 2s. and price is 6d. per lb. then when exchange is 1s. 4d. the price obtained or expected is 4d. per lb., in both cases there is the return of Rs. 11,000 against a cost of Rs. 10,000.

I stop here, hoping that some one of your numerous readers will point out if I have made any mistake. It is very important in matters of such complicated nature as mercantile transactions that the first premises or fundamental facts be clearly laid down. If this is done a correct conclusion will not be difficult to be arrived at. I have, therefore, confined myself to simple facts. If what I have said above is admitted, I shall next explain the operation of imports into India, and then consider in what way India is actually affected by the fall in exchange or in the value of silver.—Yours faithfully,

National Liberal Club, Sept. 2. DADABHAI NAOROJI.

From the Times, September 13, 1886

Sir,—Mr. Dadabhai Naoroji, in his letter to you on this subject, seems to enunciate the proposition that because he gets 6d. per lb. for cotton when exchange is 2s. per rupee, therefore he will get 4d. per lb. when exchange is 1s. 4d. But it is not so. As a matter of fact, when exchange was 2s. per rupee the price of cotton was about 3d. per lb., and now with exchange at 1s. 5d. it is about 4d. per lb. The subject is not elucidated by imaginary *data*.—Yours respectfully, R. L.

London, September 9.

From the Times, September 13, 1886.

Sir,—Allow me to point out that the account given by Mr. Dadabhai Naoroji, in the letter published in your columns of the 9th inst., of the effect on commercial transactions between India and England of a fall in the exchange value of the rupee is scarcely an adequate one.

Mr. Dadabhai Naoroji's contention is twofold—first that the commercial profit on an article of merchandise such as cotton is independent of the rate of exchange,

and secondly, that this is due to the fact that a fall in the rate of exchange is accompanied by a proportionate fall in the gold price of cotton in England.

The first of these contentions is so far correct that, although a sudden fall in exchange will, under ordinary circumstances, temporarily raise the exporter's profit above the normal level, competition will always come into play to bring it back to that level.

The second of Mr. Dadabhai Naoroji's contentions appears, however, to be based on a partial apprehension of the facts. When Mr. Dadabhai Naoroji talks of instructing his agent for a certain limit, he means, of course, that he instructs his agent not to sell below that limit. His agent, if he is a man of business, sells at the best price he can get consistently with his instructions, and this price is determined, not by the rate of exchange, but by the whole of the conditions affecting the market at the moment.

Other things being equal, the instant effect of a sudden fall in exchange is to increase the exporter's margin of profit. Competition, as your correspondent points out, immediately sets in to reduce profit to its normal level. But in what way is it that competition operates to produce this effect? Surely by inducing an increase of supply. Other things being equal it is in virtue of such an increase of supply alone that the price of the cotton in London can be lowered.

Now, increase of supply in London implies, as its correlate, increase of demand in India; and increase of demand in India implies, other things being equal, increase of price in India. In other words, equilibrium is attained, not, as your correspondent would have it, through a fall of the selling price in England proportionate to the fall in exchange, but through a fall of the selling price in England less than proportional to the fall in exchange, combined with a rise of the buying price in India less than inversely proportional to the fall in exchange.—I am, sir, your obedient servant, JAMES W. FURRELL.

Streatham Common.

From the TIMES, *September* 16, 1886.

SIR,—In reply to "R. L.'s" letter in the *Times* of yesterday, I may first explain that I made no reference to actual prices in the market, as such prices are the resultant of many influences—supply, demand, bulling and bearing speculations, present stocks and future prospects of supply, every day's telegraphic news from all parts of the world, political complications, bank rate of interest, and various other small and temporary influences. I therefore explain again that what I am considering at present is the effect of only the fall and rise in exchange, leaving all other circumstances that affect prices as unifluenced or unaltered.

"R. L." says:—"As a matter of fact, when exchange was 2s. per rupee, the price of cotton was about 3d. per lb., and now, with the exchange at 1s. 5d., it is about 4d. per lb." I do not find this to be a fact. Even were it fact it would not matter at all, as all other circumstances of supply, demand, &c., have to be taken

into account therewith. But what "R.L." states does not appear to be a fact. I shall confine myself to cotton, though I could give similar decline in other principal commodities.

Exchange began to decline about the time when Germany demonetised its silver, about 1873. The statistical abstract of the United Kingdom, 33rd number, gives the "average price" of raw cotton as follows:—

—	1873.	1874.	1875.	1876.	1877.	1878.	1879
Per cwt. £	4·01	3·62	3·47	3·02	2·93	2·80	2·76
—	1880.	1881.	1882.	1883.	1884.	1885.	—
Per cwt. £	2·94	2·92	2·93	2·91	2·85	2·86	—

This shows a fall of nearly 30 per cent.

Now Mr. Furrell's letter. He is right in supposing that the shipper's instructions mean not to sell below the limit. I have been a merchant and an agent in the City for some 25 years, and, knowing full well what my shipper meant, I sold at the best price I could get. He is also right in saying that the price is determined by the whole of the conditions affecting the market at the moment, and that is just the reason why, as I have said above, I did not refer to actual prices. So far we agree, but Mr. Furrell's fallacy begins in this sentence:—"Other things being equal, the instant effect of a sudden fall in exchange is to increase the exporter's margin of profit." Here he first forgets the "whole of the conditions to which he referred in the previous paragraph, as determining the price at any moment, and next he forgets that the increase of the margin takes place in the case of those exporters only who have already entered into their transactions, and those transactions at the moment are uncompleted, so far as the remittances of the proceeds are concerned. But those exporters who have yet to begin their transactions have no such increase in their margin of profit, as they have not yet had any transaction or margin of profit, pending or existing. I took the simplest instance of an exporter entering into a transaction at a particular rate of exchange, and described the process of the operation of that transaction from its initiation, as far as exchange alone was concerned, independent of "the whole of the conditions." And then I further explained that any fluctuation in exchange during the pendency of the transaction was the exporter's further chance of profit or loss, But I may go further, and now explain that even in the case of transactions already entered into, the fluctuations in exchange do not affect the exporter in the bulk of the trade. The bulk of the shipments from India are drawn against, and as soon as this is done, tbe exporter has no further interest at all in any subsequent fluctuations in exchange, beyond his little margin above the amount of his bill, and thus it will be seen that in most cases there is no instant effect to increase the exporter's margin of profit.—Yours faithfully, DADABHAI NAOROJI.

National Liberal Club, September 14.

From the TIMES, *September* 20, 1886.

SIR,—Mr. Dadabhai Naoroji, in his letter in the *Times* of this morning, while finding in my previous communication a "fallacy" which has no place in it, leaves altogether untouched the point really at issue between us.

After stating that the price of an article of Indian export depends, not on the rate of exchange only, but on the whole of the conditions affecting the market at the moment, I proceeded to treat the question on the basis taken up by your correspondent, and to consider the effect of the rate of exchange apart from all other conditions.

"*Other things being equal,*" I remarked, "the *instant* effect of a sudden fall in exchange is to increase the exporter's margin of profit."

Mr. Dadabhai Naoroji quotes this sentence correctly enough, but in criticising it he entirely ignores the force of the words that I have italicised. He says I first forget the "whole of the conditions" referred to in the previous paragraph, the fact being that by the words "other things being equal," I expressly exclude these conditions.

I next, your correspondent adds, forget that the increased margin of profit affects only transactions begun but not completed, while leaving unaffected the transactions not yet begun. How the "instant" effect of a sudden fall in exchange could apply to transactions not begun is not very obvious.

There was the less room for misunderstanding that I went on to say that under ordinary circumstances, competition at once came into play to reduce profit to its normal level.

The fact is Mr. Dadabhai Naoroji and myself are in agreement except on one point, to which he makes no reference in the letter under reply.

He contends that competition operates by reducing prices in England proportionally to the fall in exchange. I contend that competition operates by concurrently reducing prices in England, and raising them in India.—I am, Sir, your obedient servant.

JAMES W. FURRELL.

Streatham Common, September 15.

From the TIMES, *September* 27, 1886.

SIR,—Mr. Furrell's letter, published in the *Times* of to-day, concludes :—"The fact is Mr. Dadbahai Naoroji and myself are in agreement except on one point, to which he makes no reference in the letter under reply. He contends that competition operates by reducing prices in England proportionally to the fall in exchange. I contend that competition operates by concurrently reducing prices in England and raising them in India."

Now what Mr. Furrell says in his first letter is this :—"Competition, as your correspondent points out, immediately sets in to reduce profit to its normal level. But in what way is it that competition operates to produce this effect?" And then he answers himself by begging the whole question :—"Surely by inducing an

increase of supply." And he goes on, "Other things being equal" (though he does not allow among the "Other things" supply to remain equal), "it is in virtue of such an increase of supply alone that the price of the cotton in London can be lowered."

Now, as an independent fact, an increase of supply may, no doubt, lower prices. But it is not in virtue of an increase of supply alone that prices can be lowered in London. What I am pointing out is, how the competition and the lower price are the direct result of lower exchange or higher value of gold only, without any increase of supply being at all induced or made, and any rise in price being caused in India. The fact simply is that, because gold is of higher value, cotton is sold at as much less gold as would suffice to bring back to the exporter his actual outlay and profit. Or, putting it in another way, the manufacturer of England may send his order direct to India to buy at the silver price there, and pay his gold for it at the rate of exchange, without a single ounce of additional supply or any increase in price in India being necessitated.

What I mean, then, is simply this. To treat the subject in its simplest form, I take every other circumstance—*i. e.*, supply, demand, &c.—to remain the same, and consider the effect of exchange only, and I show that from this simple cause—viz., the lower exchange only—if price be 6d. when exchange is 2s., the price will be 4d. when exchange is 1s. 4d., irrespective of or without causing any increase whatever in the supply or in the price in India.—Yours faithfully,

DADABHAI NAOROJI.

National Liberal Club, September 20.

From the Daily News September 24, 1886.

Sir,—I now state the mode of operation of an import transaction into India. Taking all other circumstances to remain the same, suppose I am willing to lay out Rs. 10,000 for importing, say, 50 bales of grey shirtings—supposing that 2s. per rupee being the exchange—I find that I shall have to pay 6s. per piece in order that, at the market price in India I should be able to realise Rs. 11,000 on the sale. Now, when exchange goes down to 1s. 4d., I see that, unless I am able to buy in England at 4s. a piece (instead of 6s.), either I cannot send the Indent from India, or the market price must rise in India as much as I may have to pay more than 4s. in England. Under the ordinary operation of economic laws, it is not necessary that I should be obliged to pay more than 4s. per piece in England. Gold having appreciated here—in other words prices of all commodities having proportionately fallen—the cost of production to the manufacturer will be so much *less* gold. What cost him 6s. in gold before now costs him only 4s. in gold, and he is able to sell to me at 4s. for what he formerly charged 6s., the value of 4s. now being equal to that of the 6s. before, and I am able to sell at the same number of the rupees now in India as I did before when exchange was 2s. per rupee, and the price of the shirting was 6s. per piece. Suppose in England the

produce of a farm is worth £ 100, and that the landlord, the tenant, or farmer, and the labourers divided equally or £33⅓ each. Now, suppose gold having risen, the same produce is worth only £ 75. The share of each should then be £25, which, at its higher value or purchasing power, is equal to the former £33⅓. But the landlord thinks he must still have £ 33⅓, and the wage-earners ask for the same quantity of gold as before, and a struggle arises. But whatever the struggle between them (into the merits of which I need not enter here) the produce fetches £75 only (equal in value to the former £100). The manufacturer thus gets his raw produce, whether home or foreign, at the depreciated price. The manufacturer also has his difficulty with the item of wages, which, if not proportionately reduced according to the rise in gold, prevents the cost of the manufactured article being fully reduced. But the market price of the article falls in accordance with the appreciation of gold, and the indentor from India gets what he wants at such reduced gold price. Articles produced in limited quantities or of reputed makers, or of some specialities, may and do command their own prices, and Indian importers may be, or are obliged to pay some higher price for the same, but for the great bulk of the articles of trade the Indian importer has not to pay generally much more than he did before, except so far as any fluctuations in exchange during the course of the transaction may necessitate any higher or lower payment. All other circumstances remaining the same, the indentor from India pays more or less gold according to the state of the exchange, paying less gold when gold is high or exchange and silver low, or paying more gold when gold is low and exchange or silver high; the result being that the importer pays the same amount of silver whether exchange is low or high. He lays out his Rs. 10,000 and gets the goods in England at such varying prices in gold, according to exchange, as enable him to get Rs. 11,000 on sale in India.

To sum up, for the bulk of the trade, other circumstances remaining the same, India does not get for her exports more silver for her produce, but less gold at lower exchange; and she does not pay for her imports more silver, but less gold at lower exchange. In actual operation the result of course is not quite so rigid. Various influences affect the course of the market. What I mean is, that taking the simple element of appreciation of gold and fall in silver or exchange, the course of trade is not much affected in prices in India. Were India concerned merely in the fall in exchange and nothing else, that would not have mattered much to her, beyond making the owners of gold so much richer in proportion to the fall in silver, as compared with gold, and introducing an additional element of the chances of profit or loss, in the fluctuations in the rate of exchange during the pendency of the transactions. But even in that case, the exporting merchant protects himself from this risk by selling his bills against his produce to the Indian Banks, whereby the rate of exchange for his transaction is fixed. The proceeds of his produce have to pay a certain sterling amount to the bank here. As far as the banks are concerned, they are dealers in money. For every bill that

they buy in India in order to receive money in this country they sell also in India a bill to pay in this country. The two operations are entered into at the same time at different rates of exchange, and the difference of the rate is their profit of the day, all selling and buying transactions covering each other. Those exporters who do not draw against their produce or shipment, and wait for returns from England, undertake the additional chance of loss or gain of the fluctuation of exchange, just as they take the chance of loss or gain from fluctuations in price from other causes. The importer of goods into India is not so well able to protect himself against the fluctuations of exchange when he cannot buy ready-made goods, and must wait for some time for the execution of his order by the manufacturer. But by telegraphic communications and by selling bills forward here much protection is secured. Upon the whole, as I have said above, fall in exchange would not matter much to India if her trade alone were concerned. She can control her wants by taking more or less. But the direction in which India really suffers, and suffers disastrously, from the fall in exchange or silver is a different one. I shall state my views upon that subject in my next.—Yours faithfully,

DADABHAI NAOROJI.

National Liberal Club.

From the DAILY NEWS, *September* 28, 1886.

SIR,—I would give a few details of the transactions of trade between England and India to make the effect of fluctuations in exchange a little clearer. Resuming the illustration of my first letter, of Rs. 10,000 laid out for 100 bales of cotton, I first take the case in which the exporter does not draw against his shipment, but waits for remittance of proceeds of sale from England. Suppose he has based his transaction on an exchange of 1s. 4d. per rupee to sell at 4d. per ℔. to get back his Rs. 11,000. Suppose, before the cotton is sold exchange falls to 1s. 2d. This fall in exchange (all other things remaining the same, lowers the price to 3½d. per ℔., and suppose the cotton is so sold. To the exporter this fall will make no difference, as though his cotton sold at ½d. less, he gets the difference made up by the lower exchange of 2d., and thus gets the same amount of silver as he had calculated on. The same will be the result if exchange rose and price rose with it. Though he will get more gold from the rise in price, he will get as much less silver owing to the rise in exchange, the result being the original amount of silver. Suppose again that exchange falls or rises after the cotton is sold, but before the proceeds are converted into silver by the purchase of silver or bill of exchange in that case if the exchange falls, it is so much profit to the exporter as he will get more silver for the gold already secured by the sale when exchange was higher; and if exchange rises he loses, as he gets so much less silver at the higher exchange. Next I take the transaction in which the exporter draws against his cotton, so that he gets his silver back at once from the Bank that buys his draft at the exchange he has calculated on, and undertakes that the Bank shall have a fixed amount of

gold paid to it in England out of the proceeds of the sale. In other words, the exporter converts his outlay from silver into gold—*i.e.*, instead of Rs. 10,000 it is now fixed to a certain amount in gold to be paid to the Bank in England.

Now, suppose exchange falls before the cotton is sold. With the fall in exchange there is a corresponding fall in price, and the exporter realises so much less gold. But as he has already engaged to pay a fixed amount of gold to the Bank on the basis of a higher exchange, he suffers as much loss as the proceeds are shorter than the amount of the draft. A fall in exchange in such a case is a loss and not a profit to the exporter. In that case, it is the rise in exchange before produce is sold that is profitable to the exporter. Next, suppose that exchange rises or falls after the cotton is sold, that would not matter to the exporter at all, because he has not to receive any remittance, but the gold of the proceeds is to be given away to the Bank, excepting only such surplus or deficit that the proceeds may leave after the payment to the Bank. It will be seen from the above that in the two different kinds of operations—*viz.*, clear shipments and draft shipments, the results from the fluctuations of exchange are entirely the reverse of each other. In the second case, in which the shipment is drawn against, and which forms the bulk of the actual export transactions, a fall in exchange before the goods are sold is a loss, and not profit, to the shipper. In considering, therefore, the result of the fall in exchange, it is necessary to bear in mind whether the particular transaction is a free shipment or a draft shipment, for in each case the result is quite different. And as the bulk of the export trade of India is of draft shipments, the result of a fall in exchange is a risk of loss, and not a chance of profit. The shipper who draws against his shipment does not desire a fall in exchange, but a rise, before his goods are sold ; for such rise, by raising the price, will give him so much more gold to leave a balance in his favour after paying the Bank the amount of gold already contracted for and fixed by the draft. The surplus gold will go back to him as so much more profit than he had calculated upon. The general idea, that a fall in exchange is somehow or other always a gain to the exporter of produce from India, is not correct. As shown above, in the case of shipments against which bills are drawn (and which is the case with most of the export business), a fall in exchange before the cotton is sold is actually adverse and a loss to the exporter. Once exchange becomes settled, subject only to the usual small trade fluctuations, it is no matter at all whether a rupee is 2s. or 1s. The price of produce will adapt itself to the relations of gold and silver, and the exporter will get back only his outlay and usual profit, whatever the exchange may be.

In the case of imports into India, in a certain way the importer is able to be free from any risk of the fall in exchange. He telegraphs his order to his agent here to buy at a certain price at a certain exchange. The agent manages if the market allows it, to buy at the limit, and sell a bill at the same time at the required exchange. If the goods are ready made, the agent sells his bill at once. If there is delay in the manufacturing of the goods, he sells the bill forward, so that when

the goods are ready, the Bank engages to buy the bill at the stipulated rate of exchange, no matter whether the rate of the day is the same or more or less. As in the case of the exporter, it is also the same with the importer, that when exchange is normally settled it does not matter to him whether it is 2s. or 1s. per rupee. The price and the trade adjust themselves, and settle down into a normal condition, according to the relation between gold and silver. As a further elucidation of the fact that fall in exchange brings down proportionally a fall in the price of the produce exported from India, I may mention that if the holders of cotton in England did not sell their cotton in accordance with the relation between gold and silver, or in other words according to exchange, the cotton manufacturers can send their orders to Bombay to buy there at the silver price, and then pay in gold according to the exchange—*i.e.*, remit from England silver or bank bills according to the price of silver or rate of exchange. The manufacturers in England know every day what the prices are in India, and can, and often do, buy there by telegram as readily as in Liverpool or London. As this letter has already become long enough, I postpone the consideration of the actual and permanent injury to India caused by the fall from 2s. per rupee to my next letter.—Yours faithfully,

DADABHAI NAOROJI.

National Liberal Club, September 24.

APPENDIX B.

1. Government of India to Secretary of State :—

November 9, 1878.

"12. . . . . And bearing in mind the necessary fixity of much of the existing taxation, the difficulty of finding new sources of revenue, and the dissatisfaction caused by all increases of taxation, even by those for which there is the most urgent necessity, it is indisputable that the political inconvenience of this gradually increasing burden is extremely great, aggravated as it further is by the uncertainty of its amount and the impossibility of foreseeing its fluctuations, which may at any moment become the cause of the most grave financial embarrassment."—(C. 4,868, 1886, p. 19.)

2. Now is it not very strange that the necessity of avoiding additional taxation is met by laying on as heavy a taxation as possible in the covert way of creating a false rupee?

3. "74. To this might further be added that the political risks of the present time, and the prospects they create of necessary additional taxation, which, if our proposals were adopted, might be avoided wholly or to a great extent, or even be met by reduction of taxation, add force to the argument that if these changes are to be made, there would be special political advantage in making them now."—(p. 26.)

4. Now this beats everything. While by proposing the device of closing the mints, and giving a false value to the rupee, they are actually increasing the burden of taxation to the extent of the false increase of the value of the rupee, the Government, with an extraordinary *naivëte*, say that their proposals will "*even be met by reduction of taxation*"! The Government of India has beaten itself!

5. India Office to Treasury, January 26, 1886 :—

"It is not, however, upon the large amount of the charge that Lord Randolph Churchill is desirous of dwelling, so much as upon the extreme difficulty in which the Government of India is placed in regulating its finances, and the dangers that attend a position in which any sudden fall in the exchange may require the increased charge caused thereby to be met by additional taxation."—(C. 4,868, 1886, p. 4.)

6. "The imposition of additional taxation has always been a matter of much anxiety to the Indian Government, and the greatest objection has always been evinced to imposing such taxation in forms to which the people are unaccustomed or to frequent changes, or to measures which give rise to fears of possible further changes and additional taxes."—(p. 4.) Is it for this reason that this covert way was discovered to impose heavy additional taxation ?

7. Government of India to the Secretary of State for India, February 2, 1886 :—

"Speaking generally, the period of financial pressure to which we refer may be said to have extended from 1873-74 to 1880-81, and to have involved increased taxation large reductions in public works expenditure, and a heavy addition to the gold debt held in England."—(C. 4,868, 1886, p. 6.)

8. "The state of affairs would be an evil of the greatest magnitude in any country in the world; in a country such as India, it is pregnant with danger."—(p. 7.)

And so the Government of India aggravate this state?

9. "If a stable ratio between gold and silver cannot be secured we must continue to add to the gold debt of India, though we are fully aware of the objections to borrowing largely in England in a time of peace, and view with apprehension the additional burden which will be imposed on India when borrowing in England ceases, and the remittances from India must be increased in order to pay the interest charge on an increased gold debt."—(p. 8.)

Is that the reason why Government goes on increasing this debt with a light heart?

10. The words used by Lord Lytton's Government in a despatch dated November 9, 1878, might be applied almost literally to the circumstances of the present day.

11. "At the present time when political events may throw upon India new burdens of unusual magnitude, the position of our Government in relation to the question assumes a character of extreme gravity. Whether, if such demands upon us rise they would require us to have resort to increased taxation to provide additional resources from the service of the year, or to loans to meet sudden or unusual charges, or as may be more probable, to a combination of the two, the anxiety that will attend our financial administration must be very great; and if the holders of silver should under any combination of circumstances, throw any considerable quantity on the market, as is at all events possible, the consequences to India might be financially disastrous. How a sudden call to supply by taxation a million or more to provide for further loss by exchange, and one or two millions for war charges, could be met, we are at a loss to know; yet that such demands might arise no one can say is so improbable as to remove them from a serious claim on our attention. The prospects of a loan in such a case would not be much more satisfactory. Any temporary relief obtained by borrowing in England would be more than compensated by the increased burdens created in the future, and the necessary tendency of things would be to go from bad to worse." (p. 10.)

12. So it appears that this "extreme gravity, "the anxiety," and going "from bad to worse" were the reasons why wars of imperial interest were undertaken, and why increasing burdens are going on! And why it is now decided that India and India alone should bear every burden?

13. Lord Randolph Churchill, in his letter to the Treasury of January 28,1896 says:—"It is not, however, upon the large amount of the charge that Lord Randolph Churchill is desirous of dwelling so much as upon the extreme difficulty in which the Government of India is placed in regulating its finances and the dangers that attend a position in which any sudden fall in exchange may require the increased charge caused thereby to be met by additional taxation."

14. These extracts are sufficient to show the anxiety of the Government for increasing burdens on the people, and political danger to Government; and the beauty of the whole thing is, that they have done and are doing the very things which they proclaimed loudly should not be done, increased both taxation with a light heart and political danger with a vengeance?

15. I shall add what was said on the passing of the Bill in 1893:—

(C. 7,098, 1893, p. 15.)

In the Legislative Council of June 26, 1893, the Hon. Mr. Mackay, who was perhaps one of the most active persons in bringing about this legislation, said:—

"I am completely in accord with the provisions of the Bill just introduced by the Hon. Sir David Barbour, and with the greatest deference I venture to congratulate Your Excellency on having succeeded in bringing forward a measure which will have the effect, not only of restoring the finances of the country to a satisfactory condition, but which will also impart to trade and commercial transactions that legitimate amount of certainty of which they have been deprived for the past twenty years. The measure at the same time relieves the country of that dread of additional and seriously disturbing taxation which has been weighing upon it for some time past."

His Excellency the President said:—(p. 18)

16. "I think, then, that I may sum up this part of the case by saying that it has now been established almost beyond controversy that to leave matters as they were meant for the Government of India hopeless financial confusion; for the commerce of India a constant and ruinous impediment; for the taxpayers of India the prospect of heavy and unpopular burdens; for the consumers of commodities a rise in the prices of the principal necessaries of life; and for the country, as a whole, a fatal and stunting arrestation of its development (p. 20)." . . . "We earnestly hope that our proposals may be fruitful of good, that the commerce of India may be relieved from an impediment which has retarded its progress, that the Government of India may be enabled to meet its obligations without adding to the burdens of the taxpayer; and that capital will flow more freely into this country without the adventitious stimulus which we have hitherto been unable to refuse. We trust, finally, that in process of time sufficient reserves of gold may be accumulated to enable us to render our gold standard effective, and thereby to complete the great change towards which we are taking the first steps to-day. Time only can show whether all those hopes will be fulfilled or be disappointed."

17. Vain unfortunate hope! A Currency Committee is sitting again. What was said by the Treasury and others has come to pass, and all the glowing prophecies of the Indian authorities, based upon clear fallacies, have been falsified—and yet persistence in the same course!

THE PERMANENT SETTLEMENT QUESTION.

—***—

BY JOHN ADAM ESQ., M.A., *Barrister-at-Law.*

The question of Revenue Settlement has always bulked largely—certainly never too largely—in the proceedings of the Indian National Congress. In the earlier years we find it discussed for the most part in connection with the still more comprehensive question of the poverty of the Indian people. I use the latter phrase advisedly, as more correct than the popular one, the poverty of India. For India is rich, rich actually, rich potentially, beyond the dreams of avarice; yet her people are poor, poor actually, prospectively, poorer even to the depths of destitution. This is the true problem. If the country be rich, why are its people poor? In those early days the Delegates of the Congress had great hopes that they would secure a comprehensive enquiry into this great question, an enquiry by Royal Commission on the model of those great investigations held at intervals of twenty years from 1773 onwards until, in 1858, India came under the direct Government of the British Crown. A whole generation had passed away under the administration of the India office, without check or scrutiny. All hopes of such an enquiry have been long abandoned and the Congress has in consequence been led itself to point out specifically the more important causes which make and keep the people poor. Of these, we hold one of the chief to be the enormous overdraft upon the agricultural resources of the country made by the Government for the purposes of mainly unproductive expenditure—unproductive, that is to say, as far as India is concerned. The agricultural resources of a country are like a bank, on which Government draws for the sums necessary to defray its charges. These drafts, not being limited by any provision of law or economics, have become overdrafts increasing year by year. The inevitable consequences must follow. When funds are exhausted the bank breaks and no more drafts are possible. So here. The Government may go on exhausting its resources by drawing bills on futurity, but sooner or later the bills will fall due, without possibility of renewal. Hence it is that the Congress has in later years put the specific question of settlement in a foremost position in its programme.

But, as I have said, the question has been always recognised as a burning one. I do not propose to trace it minutely through all the successive

Congresses, but desire to call attention to some of the more important pronouncements by those who have addressed themselves to the subject. I do so, because I opine that the series of papers, of which this forms one, is intended to treat of the various questions discussed in connection with the Congress and exhibit concisely what the Congress says or thinks thereon. These papers are historical and compendious, not personal or argumentative. I, and many others in a like position, are constantly told, "your views are all right, but it is the views of the Congress we object to"; the objectors not by any means knowing what the views of the Congress are, but assuming that they must differ from those admitted to be correct. I do not therefore air my own views—as mine. One of the earliest as well as one of the most terse and striking pronouncements on the subject was that of the Hon. S. Subramani Iyer of Madras (now the Honourable Justice Subramani Aiyar, Dewan Bahadur, C. I. E.). Speaking at the second Congress held at Calcutta in 1886, in support of the Resolution advocating the introduction of representative institutions, he said :—

"Certainly the poverty of India, if it can be demonstrated at all, to my mind seems to be capable of demonstration in respect of the Madras Presidency. At one time it was the boast of administrators in my part of the country that it was administered under the ryotwari system and not the Zemindari system. I believe the history of the ryotwari administration has led to the conclusion that it is better to have a system of Zemindari administration, with all its faults, than the ryotwari system. It may be that the Zemindars, as is believed by some, do, in some cases, screw out every farthing from their tenants; but the Zemindars, as we, have seen, can be reached by a Tenancy Act, whereas in the Presidency of Madras, *it is impossible to control by any Tenancy Act the extortions of the Revenue authorities.* I should like to see a Government servant, on our side of India, who is prepared to admit that the right of enhancement ought to be defined and limited by legislative enactment as against the Government."

The Fourth Congress held at Allahabad, just ten years ago, passed a Resolution which shows with what excess of care and deliberation this great problem was approached. It ran thus :—

"That the question of the introduction of a Permanent Settlement of the Land Revenue Demand into the Madras and Bombay Presidencies and other Provinces be referred to the various Standing Congress Committees, with instructions to report upon the same, in so far as it affects their respective circles, to the Congress of 1889."

It does not appear that any special Reports were made, but the matter was advanced a step at Bombay in 1889, by the following significant Resolution :—

"That the Government be urged to take the subject of a Permanent Settlement once more under consideration in view to practical action thereon, such that fixity and permanency may be given to the Government Land Revenue demand *without futher delay*, at any rate, in all fully populated and well-cultivated tracts of country.

I call this resolution significant, because it indicates that the point of attack was very different then from that to which it has now been necessary to change. It was believed that both the Government of India and the Secretary of State were at one as to the grant of a "modified" permanent settlement from which re-classification of soils or a re-calculation of grain outturns should be rigidly excluded. And it was further supposed that, this being so, delay in introducing this "modified" settlement was due only to reluctance or laziness on the part of Local Governments, and that a little easy pressure in the desired direction, was alone necessary. This belief was founded on the Resolution of the Government of India in 1882, accepted by the Secretary of State in a Despatch of 1883, and interpreted by the Governments of Bombay and Madras. The following brief extracts will show the substantial grounds of that belief. The Government of India says :—

"The existing system of complete periodical settlements involves serious evils, the most prominent of which are, the uneasiness arising from uncertainty, the risk of undue enhancements, the annoyance to the people and cost to the state of field operations and detailed enquiries into the returns of landed property, and the check to expenditure on improvements These evils, it was thought, might in the main be avoided, without incurring the disadvantages of assessments absolutely fixed in perpetuity. It has therefore been decided that, in the first place, the rule already existing, but which, on the half-assets principle, has not always been observed, shall be effectually enforced, that assessments shall not be enhanced on account of improvements made by the owner or cultivator. Subject to this rule, and where experience has shown existing settlements to be reasonably adequate and equitable, there will be no general revision of the field work and assessments will be raised on three grounds only :— Extension of cultivation, increase of produce due to improvements made by the state, and rise of prices, enhancements on the latter ground being strictly limited. These principles, which have been in general accepted by the Local Governments and approved by the Secretary of State, will for the future govern the revision of periodical settlements throughout India."

In Bombay, in the discussion which ensued at the second reading of the Bill No. 3 of 1885 to amend the Bombay Land Revenue Code, the Hon'ble Mr. Peile, now Sir James Peile, and member of the India Council said :—

" The obligation binding on this Government in these matters, and especially in regard to avoiding re-classification wherever it can be avoided, is guaranteed by a higher mandate than any provisions which could be inserted in a Local Act. It is guaranteed by the broad principles for the security and encouragement of agriculture laid lown by supreme authority for the whole Indian Empire... The objects held in view by the Government of India in 1883 were :—

(1) That a period should be fixed in the fiscal history of every district after which there should be no further attempts to obtain fresh valuation of the soil;

(2) That the future assessments of Land Revenue should be arranged under such rules and in such a manner as will enable the proprietors of land to forecast with tolerable precision and without official aid the enhancement of revenue to which they will in future be subject;

(3) That the settlement should be such as to secure to landholders the profits of all improvement which they may make on their estates."

In Madras the Standing Orders of the Board of Revenue contained the following instructions :—

"It is to be explained, however, to the ryots that there will be no re-classification of the soils or calculations of fresh grain values, that the rates of assessment will be revised entirely with reference to prices and that no attempt will be made to assess any additional value which may have been given to land by improvements effected by ryots, even if carried out by means of capital borrowed from Government."

And the Government of Madras in an Order dated 4th July 1889 said :—

"Nor has the Government any intention of revising the classification of soils. This principle has been repeatedly laid down and is very clearly stated in the Settlement Manual, The statement to the contrary in the Manual of administration is incorrect."

In 1890 the ground had to be again somewhat changed. There seemed little inclination on the part of the Indian Governments to carry out even the "modified settlements" of 1882, and it was found necessary to remind the authorities, that there existed earlier and even surer foundation for the people's claims. It was no new theory, tentatively suggested, that resulted in the conditions just quoted. Twenty years before, the problem had been a burning one; twenty years before, India's Rulers had given pledges, as yet unfulfilled. Therefore the Resolution of the Calcutta Congress of 1890 ran as follows:—

"That having reference to the expectation created throughout the country by the despatch of Her Majesty's Secretary of State in 1862, the principles of which were re-affirmed in a subsequent despatch of 1865, promising the extension of a permanent settlement to all temporarily settled tracts in which certain conditions were fulfilled, and to the facts that throughout large portions of the country those conditions have long since been fulfilled, this Congress respectfully submits that the Government of India is now in honor bound to take up this question of permanent settlement without further delay, in view to practical action thereon, such that fixity and permanence may be given to the Government Land Revenue Demand as explicitly promised, by Her Majesty's Secretary of State, more than a quarter of a century ago."

This Resolution was proposed by Mr. R. N. Mudholkar of Berar, and the debate was one of exceptional interest. Mr. Mudholkar pointed out that the extraordinary pressure of the agricultural population on the land, and of the population as a whole upon the cultivable area, inevitably resulted in recurring agricultural crises. When such a crisis occurs Government takes broad and statesman-like views and makes liberal promises for the future; but when the pinch is relaxed and danger is over, these promises are forgotten and there is a return to the "huckstering policy." The famine in the N. W. Provinces in 1860 led to the undertaking of 1862. A commission was appointed to

enquire into that famine. The President of the Commission wrote as follows in his Report :—

"I have before described the condition of agricultural property antecedent to the existing settlements, and it will probably be admitted, without serious qualification, that a state of things more likely to weaken the society living under it could scarcely be conceived. To great and unequal pressure of public burdens and arbitrary interferences have succeeded assessments rarely heavy, titles recorded and easily understood, long leases, and the enjoyments of all the profits during the currency of such leases. The natural results of such a change in so vital a part of the social economy have grown more and more apparent. Land has obtained an increasing marketable value. Its value as a security has, doubtless, been largely made use of in mitigating the pressure of famine. Such, then, having been the general results of the protracted fixity of the public demand, the security of titles, the general moderation of assessments, the recognition and general record of rights,—the inference seems irrestible that, to intensify and perpetuate these results, we must proceed still further in the same healthy and fruitful direction. The good which has been done by partial action on sound principles is both a justification and an encouragement to further advances ; and entertaining the most earnest conviction that the state interests and popular interests will be alike strengthened in an increasing ratio by the step, the first and, as I believe, most important measure I have respectfully to submit for consideration is the expediency of fixing for ever the public demand on the land, and thus converting the existing settlement into a settlement of perpetuity".

This recommendation was supported by three successive Lieutenant-Governors of these provinces, Sir George Edmonstone, the Hon. Edmund Drummond, and Sir William Muir, as well as by many experienced officials. The Governor-General, Lord Canning, not only approved of it, but recommended, as further salutary measures, the sale of waste lands free of land tax and permission to redeem the land revenue. On this it is said :—

"His Excellency in Council sees no reason to doubt that as far as either measure might take effect, it would be in every way beneficial. As to waste lands there could be no question...... His Excellency in Council has still less doubts as to the beneficial results of permitting a redemption of the land revenue. He believes that increased security of fixed property and comparative freedom from the interference of fiscal officers of the Government will tend to create a class which, although composed of various races and creeds will be peculiarly bound to the British rule ; while under proper regulations, the measure will conduce materially to the improvement of the general revenue of the empire."

It will hence be seen that Lord Canning recognised the economic and political value of permanence of settlement as fully as his predecessor Lord Cornwallis. But the Secretary of State had still to make his pronouncement, and the result was a Despatch, long venerated as his charter by the Indian land-holder. In this Despatch, written in July 1862, and frequently endorsed since, the then Secretary of State, Sir Charles Wood, afterwards Lord Halifax, writes thus :—

"After the most careful review of all these considerations, Her Majesty's Government are of opinion that the advantages which may be reasonably expected to accrue, not only to those immediately concerned with the land but to the community generally, are sufficiently great

to justify them in increasing the risk of some prospective loss of land revenue in order to attain them, and that a settlement in perpetuity in the districts in which the conditions required are or may be hereafter fulfilled is a measure dictated by sound policy and calculated to accelerate the development of the resources of India, and to insure in the highest degree the welfare and contentment of all classes of her Majesty's subjects in the country."

Mr. Mudholkar pointed out that the conditions prescribed in the Despatch of 1862 and 1865 had been fulfilled throughout nearly the whole country; that famine and want had over and over again disorganised the agricultural resources of the country, and yet there was no disposition to carry out principles repeatedly laid down and constantly admitted to be just.

I now call attention to an important passage of Mr. Mudholkar's speech. This shows that the Congress leaders themselves are no advocates of extreme views; they go no farther than Government itself has gone; and this also disposes of the argument, or assertion, so telling with an ignorant audience, that the Congress desires to have all over India an exact replica of the Bengal Settlement of Lord Cornwallis. Mr. Mudholkar says.—

"I admit that there are grave difficulties in the way of Government from the rupee going down. Of course it would be difficult to settle the question in an off-hand manner but I do not think the difficulty is such as to baffle the resources of statesmansship, nor do I think that our administrators are so devoid of statesmanship as to be unable to grapple with it. What we ask is, that there should be some fixity, that fixity need only be as regards production. If the proportion of produce to rent were fixed; if it were laid down once for all that each plot should pay yearly the money value, settled quinquennially on the basis of the preceding five years local prices, of so many maunds of jowar, bajra, wheat, barley, cotton, sessamum, as the case might be, due reference being had to the culture prevalent in each village, I suppose that would satisfy the requirements of the people. It is a problem which can be solved. I appeal to Great Britain and to our administrators here to make a real effort to solve it, and thus carry out the principle laid down by successive Governments in England—principles which have their greatest justification in justice and in humanity."

It will thus be seen that the Congress is no blind advocate of the Bengal Settlement. True we refer, and shall never cease referring, to the broad-minded and statesmanlike reasonings of men like Cornwallis and Teignmouth, which culminated in the Bengal Settlement. But we can do this without endorsing in all its details that settlement. Indeed it should never be forgotten that those great men while absolutely at one as to the great principles, at once just and profitable, which inevitably demanded fixity and permanence, were yet seriously at variance as to practical measures, as to both the manner and the time of the proposed settlements. Teignmouth was in favour of some delay and of experimental or tentative measures, afraid, lest lack of experience on the part of the foreign rulers might lead to irretrievable wrongs—although curiously enough his greatest fear was that the settlement would be fixed *too high* and lead to rack renting.

Cornwallis, on the other hand, considered the benefits accruing from fixity to be so enormous as to override all other considerations. I have often quoted, and make no excuse for quoting again, the pregnant sayings of Lord Teignmouth, then Mr. Shore, which should be ever the watchwords of Indian Land Reformers. I confine myself to three sentences.

"*The necessity of giving confidence to our subjects is absolute.*"

"*It is allowed that a considerable degree of inequality is a less evil than a very great degree of uncertainty.*"

"*To render the value of what we possess permanent, our demand should be fixed.*"

And Cornwallis declared that as he had "a clear conviction in his own mind of the utility of the system," he considered it his duty to the Indians, to his country, and to humanity, "to recommend it most earnestly to the Court of Directors *to lose no time in declaring the permanency of the settlement.*"

But while faults may be found with the Bengal Settlement, it serves one very useful function. It is there to illustrate by actual facts the benefits springing from permanency. These were amply illustrated by Mr. Boikanthanath Sen, a Bengal landholder. He first showed that the incidence of the Land Revenue in Bengal is Rs. 55 to 100 persons of the population; in the Panjaub Rs. 109 per 100; in the North West Provinces Rs. 129; in Madras, Rs. 134; and in Bombay Rs. 234. What has been the result of this low incidence in Bengal? At the time of the Permanent Settlement only one-third of the 120,000 square miles affected by it were cultivated, while now "you will scarcely find one-thirtieth uncultivated." No doubt Government stands aghast at the huge "unearned increment," and some excuse may be made for its itching palm. But after all what becomes of the money? If Government had it, we know where it would go; where does it go? Part of it, a considerable part, returns to Government in the shape of taxation, for with a prosperous people all the other sources of taxation become more lucrative; and a very considerable proportion is spent—apart from Government—on objects which would otherwise demand Government expenditure. Thus both directly and indirectly Government profits more than it cares to admit. Mr. Sen gave one remarkable instance. Thus, "On education in Bengal, 83 lakhs are spent, out of which only 21 lakhs are spent by the State, the balance being spent by private individuals, who are able to pay on account of the Permanent Settlement." Well might Sen quote and apply the verse of Kalidasa.

"The sun draws the water from the soil, but this is returned a thousand fold in the shape of rain."

The Congress of 1891 was held in the Central Provinces, where the pinch

has been severely felt, and which were settled for the first time by Sir Richard Temple, a settlement about to expire in 1891. The question was therefore a burning one, but I have space to do no more than quote from the very remarkable speech of Mr. K. G. Deshpande of Nagpore ; and I make this quotation because it embodies the views of two such able and well-known men as Sir Richard Temple and Sir Auckland Colvin. Mr. Deshpande says :—

"A permanent limitation of the State demand was distinctly promised to the people of these provinces by Sir Richard Temple as the head of the administration. I read in support the following, from one of his administration reports. "The period over which the limitation of the Government demand according to the new assessment is to extend, is thirty years for all districts alike ; this has been sanctioned by Government. It has also been recommended that the boon of the Permanent Settlement, that is the limitation of the Government demand in perpetuity, should be conceded to those landholders who might have brought their estates to a high state of cultivation.

"The Government have decided that after a lapse of three years from the commencement of the new settlement, those landholders who may be thought worthy of the concession, and who may desire a perpetual limitation of the Government demand may have their assessments revised with a view to such limitation in perpetuity being declared."

The advantages of the above policy cannot be better described than in the following words of Sir Richard Temple himself :—

"It would have an effect altogether beyond immediate calculation in stimulating the industry, enterprise, and self-reliance of the agriculturists, the application of capital and the accumulation of wealth where the assessments were fair. It would be accepted as a great boon by the people ; on the one hand the state no doubt will subject itself to prospective loss by surrounding all future rights to increase its land revenue. But on the other land such loss would be more than compensated by the gradual, if not rapid, increase of all the other branches of revenue."

"These branches entirely depend upon the growth of the wealth in the mass of the people. A permanent settlement will contribute more than any measure that could be devised to augment that wealth. It follows that a Permanent Settlement will cause all other heads of revenue, except the land-tax, to increase. Now in these provinces more than one third of the total revenue is derived from taxes other than that imposed upon the land. The other taxes are increasing, the land tax alone will remain stationary. In a fiscal point of view, then, there can be no fear for the success of a measure which would, while restricting the land-tax, cause all other taxes to rise."

The evils of constant revisions of settlements have been thus described by Sir. Auckland Colvin in one of his minutes :

"The value of the property depreciated until the exact amount of the new assessment is declared, credit affected, heart-burning and irritation between landlord and tenant, suspicion of the intention of the government, a host of official underlings scattered broadcast over the villages,"

Mr. Deshpande was as moderate as Mr. Mudholkar; he too desired nothing more than a fixing of the Revenue *in kind*. He said ;

"Admitting however that the Government cannot fix the land revenue in cash permanently, it is yet possible to give fixity to its demand by *settling once for all the rate of land revenue* in kind for various classes of soil. If the Government follows the simple and broad classifications of soil known to the people, and does not introduce refinements of its own in the matter; if for each class of soil thus ascertained revenue in kind be fixed permanently and for ever, the Government will be in a position to benefit by any future rise in price and, at the same time, will give to the people that feeling of security which alone can induce them to spend their capital and put forth their strength in the cultivation of land."

Passing on to the Congress of 1894, we find it meeting at Madras, where settlement was a burning question, where in fact the proceedings of the Government seemed to set at defiance all the principles laid down for guidance by the Government of India and the Secretary of State. Forgetful or careless of its own pronouncements and engagements already quoted, that Government as each settlement of 30 years fell in, was found introducing an immense and intricate process of re-classification of soils and re-valuation of grain outturns; and re-assessing the various districts in accordance with the results of that process. This was dubbed the scientific system and was half-heartedly excused as an attempt to correct mistakes made in previous settlements, but its scientific accuracy was marred by two considerations. First, it was avowedly not applied to those portions of districts where the correction of mistakes was expected to result in a lowering of the assessment and consequent redressing of the consequences of the errors made by earlier settlement officers. Secondly, it was not carried out at all. Alarmed by the enormous enhancement which would be necessitated, no one dared to carry it out to its scientific extremity; and the ultimate enhancement was really the outcome of a rough guess as to what might be with safety imposed on the district. To be precise; in Tanjore, the Revenue before the settlement amounted to 41 lakhs. The settlement officers reported that, "*if the district were to be treated on scientific principles* the increase would be 28 lakhs or 70 *per cent*". Government decided on an enhancement of 11½ lakhs or 28 per cent. Further, Government had previously laid down that the conditions in Trichinopoly were substantially the same as in Tanjore and enjoined the application of a similar scientific method. This would have caused an increase of assesssment from 15 to 25½ lakhs; but the scientific method proved elastic and adaptable and brought out an increase of only 5 lakhs or 33 per cent. Thus the same system similarly applied under the same conditions, brought out in one case an increase of 70 per cent., in the other of 33 per cent. It is not surprising that considerable dissatisfaction should be expressed at the apparent divergence between the principles and practice of the Government and this dissatisfaction found eloquent expression at the Madras Congress. Government, it may be added, showed commendable alacrity in causing this divergence to disappear; but they did so, not by

making their practice conform to their principles but by bending their principles to suit the practice. By an order dated 11th May 1895, the Standing Order already quoted was cancelled and the following substituted :

" At each settlement and re-settlement of a district, Government will fix *at its discretion* the period for which such settlement or re-settlement shall be in force. The Collector shall then notify the period in the District Gazette, and explain to the ryots that the new rates will not be liable to alteration during the currency of the settlement period; but on the expiry of the said period Government reserves to itself the right to revise the assessment in such manner as may then seem just and proper, either with reference solely to a rise or fall in prices, or with reference also to other considerations such as would require a re-classification of soils or a re-calculation of the grain out-turns."

The resolution on settlement was at Madras promoted to the second place on the list of motions and was again proposed by Mr. Boikuntanath Sen. It was of a comprehensive nature; on the one hand it called attention to and reprobated the action of the Government in interfering with the permanent settlement where already in force—action which showed how far the rulers had strayed from the old principles by which Indian legislation had been guided, and it further entreated the Government to carry out the pledges of their predecessors and grant a settlement of at least sixty years' duration.

The motion runs as follows :—

" That this Congress desires to express the profound alarm which has been created by the action of the Government in interfering with the existing permanent settlement in Bengal and Behar (in the matter of survey and other classes) and with the terms of sunnads of permanently settled estates in Madras; and deeming such interference with solemn pledges a national calamity, hereby pledges itself to oppose in all possible legitimate ways all such re-actionary attacks on permanent settlements and their holders, and resolves to petition Parliament in that behalf".

" That this Congress regrets extremely that the Government of India have not only failed to carry out the pledges (given by the Secretary of State in his despatches of 1862 and 1865) for Permanent Settlement in the provinces in which it does not exist, but have also failed to give effect to the policy of granting the modified fixity of tenure and immunity from enhancement laid down in 1882 and 1884 by the Government of India and approved by the Secretary of State ; and this Congress hereby entreats the Government of India to grant a modified fixity of tenure and immunity from enhancement of land tax for a sufficiently long period of not less than sixty years so as secure to land-holders the full benefits of their own improvements. "

The debate was long and interesting but we do not require to refer to it more particularly, for it could do little more than repeat the old arguments, once more quote the Government against itself, and adduce illustrative incidents from various districts. The same remarks apply to succeeding Congresses down to that held at Amraoti in December 1897, when the present writer had the honour of moving the following resolution :—

"That this Congress enters its emphatic protest against the policy of Government in provinces where the settlement of Land Revenue is periodical in reducing the duration of the settlement while enhancing its amount, and expresses its firm conviction that in the interests of the country it is absolutely necessary that the Land Revenue in such provinces should be permanently settled."

As was pointed out, the wording of this resolution, brief as it is, shows that the evil is getting worse; the enhancements are everywhere increasing in amount while the periods are being curtailed. It has been most unfortunate for the people that the recurring period of revision has fallen in so many places just as the Government is in the hardest straits for money to meet expenditure which many, here and in Great Britain, consider unproductive and unnecessary. The hint has not been lost, and therefore care has been taken to ensure that too long time shall not elapse before the pagoda tree can be again shaken over the Government coffers.

There is hardly now in any quarter a pretence of denying that the sole cause of this change of front, the sole excuse for draining away the wealth of the people, not merely the interest but the capital, not only the increment but the corpus, is "the exigencies of Government." The Board of Revenue in Madras has in so many words admitted it. As we commenced by pointing out, the policy is a shortsighted one; it is doomed to end in National Bankruptcy. The preceding remarks will show that the Congress at least has not failed in its duty in prophesying the inevitable result, and in directing our rulers into a safer, if a harder path, a path, however, illuminated by the wisdom and uprightness of the great men who have trodden therein. We are to have a new Viceroy and a new Financier, both, as we hope and believe, free from prejudice and superior to official guidance, men who have been accustomed to think and act for themselves; and whom success has rendered confident in their own powers and judgment. Let us hope they will approach this great Land Question—so intimately connected with both the financial and social prosperity of the country—in the spirit in which they have successfully attacked other great problems; and place it permanently on a basis financially sound and socially elevating.

THE POVERTY OF INDIA.

—***—

ALFRED NUNDY, ESQ., *Barrister-at-Law.*

OF the many vexed problems which are agitating the minds of those interested in India, perhaps the one most perplexing is that which relates to the economic condition of the people of this country. It is affirmed by some, that India was at one time poor and ill-governed, and is now wealthy and prosperous, whilst others most strongly controvert this proposition. On the one side a number of reasons are advanced to prove its prosperity, on the other side an equally large number of reasons are brought forward to prove its poverty. It would be desirable, therefore, to obtain a clear idea of the different issues that are raised, and to collect and sift the evidence with respect to each issue separately. I shall therefore divide the discussion of this subject into four parts.

PART I. India as it was and as it now is.
PART II. The Evidence advanced as to India's prosperity.
PART III. The Evidence as to India's poverty.
PART IV. The Cause of India's poverty.

PART I.—INDIA AS IT WAS AND AS IT NOW IS.

The Benefits of a Stable and Civilised Government.—The first point that would strike any writer on this subject, is the conflict between official and non-official evidence as to the present condition of India. If any credence is to be placed on official statements, the prosperity of India is increasing by leaps and bounds; if non-official evidence is to be relied on, the struggle for existence on the part of a large proportion of the population is getting more and more severe and hopeless every day, whilst the finances of the country are tending slowly, but surely, towards bankruptcy. Sir W. H. Fowler with all the authority of his high position as Secretary of State for India, stated in the House of Commons in 1894 with reference to the poverty of India, "My point is that under British rule, poverty has not increased, but diminished—and so far from this poverty of India being attributable to British administration, the facts show exactly the opposite;" and on a subsequent occasion he added, "The story of the government of India by Great Britain, was one of the most wondrous stories in all our history. There was no parallel to it in the history of our own or other countries.

As an Englishman I am prouder of what this country had done in India, than what had been done at home." The achievements of England in India are indeed wonderful, and not the least amongst them is the fact, that a handful of Englishmen are able to hold in subjection a country with a population of hundreds of millions, and that whatever be the lot of the people, they are content to be governed by a nation, as to whose good intentions they entertain no doubt, and which alone they consider is capable of affording them protection both from internal disturbance and from foreign aggression. In the words of the late Sir Madhava Rao, "the truth must be frankly and gratefully admitted, that the British Government of India is incomparably the best government we have ever had. It is the strongest, and the most righteous, and the best suited to India's diverse populations and diverse interests. It is the most capable of self-maintenance, of self-renovation, and self-adjustment, in reference to the progressive advancement of the subject races."

England's Gain from India.—"But," that great statesman goes on to add, "it would be contrary to human nature itself to expect that the British nation should undertake the heavy duty and responsibility of governing and defending India without any advantage whatever to itself." Yes, great as is the benefit which India derives from England, it is an undoubted fact that England's gain is no less great. India has contributed to a large extent to make the English nation perhaps the richest in the world. Whilst on the one hand it supplies an unlimited field for England's commerce, on the other hand, it affords employment to a large number of English youths, who after a sojourn in this country return to their own land to add to its material prosperity. Sir Henry Brackenbury, the late Military Member of the Viceroy's Council, stated in his evidence before the Royal Commission on Indian expenditure: "But I cannot but feel that England's interest or Britain's interest in keeping India under British rule is enormous. India affords employment to thousands of Britons, India employs millions of British capital, and Indian commerce has been of immense value to Great Britain." Sir G. S. White, the late Commander-in-Chief of India, stated in the Viceregal Council: "We maintain that the Indian army does supply a great addition of military power to England, that a large part of the British army is trained at the expense of India, and that the whole of the men passed into the reserve have been maintained out of the Indian revenues." Lord Roberts in replying to an address of the London Chamber of Commerce in 1893, said: "I rejoice to learn that you recognise how indissolubly the prosperity of the United Kingdom is bound up with the retention of that vast Eastern Empire." Professor Lecky writes: "India is proving a school of inestimable

value for maintaining some of the best and most masculine qualities of our race." "Without India England would cease to be a nation," said Lord Randolph Churchill shortly before his death, and his sentiments were echoed by one whose utterance naturally possesses at present a great value in India, *viz.*, our Viceroy-designate, who, in 1895, at a meeting of the Baloon Society, said: "England's fate is linked with India. England could no more exist without India, than India could exist without England." And but the other day Lord Curzon stated that he was glad and proud to assume the new office to which he had been appointed, as "India had always appeared to be the "pivot and centre, I do not say the geographical, but the political centre "of our Imperial system." There is therefore a consensus of opinion that England has gained much, and is likely to gain much by its connexion with India. Apart then from feelings of justice and humanity, it is to England's interests to see India prosperous and happy, for the more prosperous it is, the more will it contribute to the advancement and greatness of England.

The Value of Official Evidence.—Is India then prosperous, and is its teeming population better prepared than it was before, in its struggle for existence? The evidence on this point of an Indian, however intelligent, thoughtful, and unprejudiced he may be, is decried as being the outcome of a mind which is prevented, by its natural bias against a foreign domination, from appreciating the merits of an alien Government; whilst the non-official Englishman who visits the country is dismissed with the remark that he is lacking in the experience necessary to enable him to ascertain the real state of the country, and that he allows the promptings of a sympathetic heart to get the better of his judgment. There then remains the official evidence. Can this be relied on? Is it not open to the retort that an official from the very position in which he is placed is sometimes unwilling, and sometimes unable, to face the truth, which would constitute a sure and certain condemnation of the Government he serves, and the utterance of which would be construed as a breach of discipline by that Government, and would perhaps be visited by censure or punishment of some kind? Officials, however intelligent, experienced, and humane they may be, are unfortunately anything but free agents. They are no doubt experts on any matter touching the condition of the country, but they can only speak at their peril. One of the ablest and most competent officials that I have come across in the course of a long experience was a Civilian in the North-Western Provinces, who, whilst the Local Government had deliberately closed its eyes, drew public attention to the heavy mortality, the result of a famine that was then raging in that Province in 1876. His opportune and humane action saved perhaps hundreds of thousands of lives, but it was at the sacrifice of his own future career and

advancement. He was transferred to the Central Provinces, had a black mark put against his name, and eventually finding that he was being superseded by his juniors, he quitted the service in disgust. Mr. Disraeli, the great Conservative leader, speaking in the House of Commons in 1878, said, that, " men brought up in the military or civil service of India might be gifted with great intelligence and possessed of great knowledge, but born as they had been in the abuses of the system, they were not sensible of such abuses, and with such men exercising supreme authority, you could not feel sure that you would get the redress that English protection ought to secure." Lord Hartington (the present Duke of Devonshire) spoke thus in 1883 in the House of Commons : " The Anglo-Indian, whatever may be his merits, and no doubt they are just, is not a person who is distinguished by an exceptionally calm judgment, " while Mr Gladstone, perhaps the greatest statesman England has ever produced, shortly before his retirement, used the following remarkable words as regards Indian official opinion : " I must make the admission that I do not think that in this matter we ought to be guided exclusively, perhaps, even principally, by those who may consider themselves experts. It is a very sad thing to say, but unquestionably it happens not infrequently in human affairs, that those who might, from their position, know the most and the best, yet from their prejudices and prepossessions know the least and worst. I certainly for my part, do not propose to abide finally and decisively by official opinion. " But, be it said to the honor of English officials that, notwithstanding the peculiar and embarrassing position they are placed in, some of them have ventured to depict the state of the country as it is, and have lifted their warning voice as to the danger which threatens the near future, unless something is done to relieve the poverty of the masses. It is the opinion of these men that will frequently be cited in these pages.

India as it Was.—When Sir H. Fowler and others holding similar opinions say that poverty is decreasing in India, they thereby imply that in former times this country was poorer than it is now. On the other hand when those who hold the opposite view assert that India is growing poorer every day, they leave the inference to be drawn that the condition of the people at one time was more prosperous. It is therefore desirable to obtain a precise idea as to the state of the country previous to the advent of the English in India. It was the " untold wealth of the Indies " that drew European nations to this country. India to the East of the Indus was first made known to Europe by the historians and men of science who accompanied Alexander the Great in 327 B. C. Though after the retirement of this monarch, Europe held but little intercourse with the East, yet an extensive

trade was carried on by the Greeks and Arabs with India, which was able to supply commodities ,that could not be produced in any other part of the world. The Arabians then formed settlements on the Eastern Coasts of the Deccan, and by their vessels, or by inland caravans, the rich productions of India were sold to the Venetians or Genoese on the shores of the Mediterranean or of the Euxine. It was this Indian trade which in medieval times contributed to the rise of the Italian cities on the seashore to a pitch of prosperity and wealth which was for long the envy of the rest of Europe. But India still continued a land of mystery and adventure. Stray travellers brought back stories of powerful kingdoms and untold wealth, and it is from their accounts we glean what may be considered a fairly accurate condition of the country. Elphinstone in his valuable history drawn from original sources gives on p. 488 the opinions of a number of persons of various countries who visited India in the fifteenth and sixteenth centuries.

" The condition of the people in ordinary times does not appear to have borne the marks of oppression. The historian of Firuz Shah (A. D. 1351 to 1394) expatiates on the happy state of the ryots, the goodness of their houses and furniture, and the general use of gold and silver ornaments by their women. He is a panegyrical writer, and not much to be trusted; but he says, among other things, that every ryot had a good bedstead and a neat garden; and the mere mention of such circumstances shows a more minute attention to the comforts of the people than would be met with in a modern author.

The general state of the country must, no doubt, have been flourishing. Nicolo di Conti, who travelled about A. D. 1420, speaks highly of what he saw about Guzerat, and found the banks of the Ganges (or perhaps the Thegna) covered with towns amidst beautiful gardens and orchards, and passed four famous cities before he reached Maarazia which he describes as a powerful city filled with gold and silver and precious stones. Barbosa and Bartima who travelled in the first year of the sixteenth century corroborate those accounts. The former in particular describes Cambay as a remarkably well-built city, in a beautiful and fertile country filled with merchants of all nations, and with artisans and manufacturers like those of Flanders. Even Ibu Batuta who travelled during the anarchy and oppression of Mahomed Toghlak's reign (about 1340 or 1350), though insurrections were raging in most parts through which he passed, enumerates many large and populous towns and cities and gives a high impression of the state in which the country must have been before it fell into disorder. Baber in the beginning of the sixteenth century, although he regards Hindoostan with the same dislike that Europeans still feel, speaks of it as a rich and noble country, abounding in gold and silver, and expresses his astonishment at the swarming population, and the innumerable workmen in every trade and profession. The part of India still retained by the Hindoos was no wise inferior to that possessed by the Mahomedans. Besides the writers already mentioned Abdoolrazzek, an ambassador from the grandson of Tamerlane, visited the south of India in A. D. 1442, and all concur in giving the impression of a prosperous country.'

" It should not escape notice that gold and silver after circulating in every other quarter of the globe, come at length to be swallowed up, lost in some measure in Hindoostan. Supplying itself with articles of foreign growth or manufacture does not prevent Hindoostan from absorbing a large portion of the gold and silver of the world—for the merchants who bring them find it advantageous to take back in exchange the productions of the country."—*Bernier's Travels*, pp. 20, 23.

Why Evidence as to present condition is conflicting.—Such was India before the advent of the English. It was the emporium of the world, and its teeming population accumulated wealth by the sale of its products which were sought for as much in Europe as in Asia and Africa. What is its present condition? There is a conflict of opinion on the subject, the one side contending that India is getting richer every day, the other side that it is growing poorer. But this conflict arises to a great extent owing to the confusion of ideas as to what each side is speaking about. The one points to the increase of population, the enormous exports and imports, to the introduction of the railway, and the telegraph, and to the scientific though complex machinery of Government, as indications of the prosperity of the country, forgetting that it is just possible that many institutions perfect in themselves which prove the prosperity of a civilised nation, may be absolutely inapplicable and unsuitable to a country like India, and that many a measure praiseworthy in itself and prompted by the best of motives may fail to secure the end it has in view, that of promoting the welfare of those for whose benefit it is devised. Supposing the Government were to introduce the electric light into a little town, and tax the inhabitants for so doing, the result would be no doubt very creditable, that of elevating it to a condition similar to a town in a civilised country, but it would at the same time throw a burden on the people that would be simply intolerable. Many of the performances of the British Government in India, which are eagerly pointed out to prove its excellence are of a similar nature. They are both unsuitable and too costly for the country. The inference therefore is forced and unwarrantable, that is drawn as to the prosperity of India arising necessarily from the good Government, perfect laws, and European institutions, that have been grafted on a plant that is peculiarly oriental in its growth.

The advocates of the theory that India is getting poorer every day point on the other hand to the condition of the masses as affording the proper test as to the prosperity of the country. What, say they, is the good of offering the starving ryot a telegraph post when he is crying for bread, or what satisfaction is it to him to hear the virtues of a railway chanted to him when his children are dying from complaints brought about by a half-filled stomach? Or what consolation is it to him to find the money-lending class adding to its ill-gotten gains at his expense, or the export merchant deriving a handsome profit in bartering away what is in fact the life blood of the country? Besides what is the number of these lucky individuals as compared to the mass of the people? Very small indeed. If then railroads and telegraphs and the well-being of a handful of persons constitute a sure index to the prosperity of a nation, then is India rich and prosperous; but

if the condition of the masses is to be the test of the material advancement of a country, then indeed have we reason to deplore the fate of India.

The Mass of Indians are Agriculturists.—Who then are the mass of the people of India of the present day? Unfortunately there is no conflict of opinion on this subject, for all are agreed it is the agriculturists. Lord George Hamilton, when introducing the Budget in the House of Commons last year said, "India is almost a purely agricultural country." So largely does the cultivation of the soil form part of the occupation of the Indian people, that, says Sir William Hunter, "even in considerable towns the traders and handicraftsmen frequently possess plots of land of their own, on which they raise sufficient grain to supply their families with food." How large is the proportion of those dependent on the soil will be seen from the report of the Famine Commissioners who after an elaborate examination of the subject arrived at the conclusion that "90 per cent. of the rural population, or rather more than 80 per cent. of the total population is closely connected with the land." It will therefore be seen how indispensable it is to ascertain the condition of the agricultural classes to enable us to arrive at a definite conclusion as to whether India as a whole is prospering or not. The agriculturists practically comprise the India of to-day, and if their condition is miserable, the material advancement of the rest is but of little account.

"No society" says Adam Smith "can really be flourishing and happy of which the greater part of the members are poor and miserable". "It is not" says another writer, "immense wealth in the hands of the higher classes, our land-owners, merchants and manufacturers which constitute the wealth of a nation, but the absence of any general poverty among the middle and working classes, and an accumulating stock of sheep and oxen and other cattle, with garners well-stored with corn, and warehouses well-stocked with all the other necessaries of life, which constitute the real wealth of a nation. When these things exist under wise rulers and a free Government, there is little danger of a nation's peace being disturbed by internal discontent. As the Scriptures say 'Happy are the people who are in such a case.'"

India as it is to-day.—In some respects India is indeed fortunate. Perhaps never in its history had it a Government that was so stable and so good-intentioned, a Government that had so well succeeded in securing peace within, and an absolute freedom from invasion from abroad. Education is gradually making its way amongst all classes, whilst a knowledge of the European arts and sciences is in a measure being introduced into the country. Railroads, telegraphs, hospitals, and water works testify to what an enlightened and civilized Government is capable of doing. But when all this is said and admitted gratefully, there still remains the question as to what is the condition of the mass of the people, who, as we have seen before, are the agriculturists. The personal observations of the writer or the opinions of prominent Indians may be looked upon as tinged with bias; but from

official records and the declared views of eminent Anglo-Indian authorities and distinguished statesmen in England, sufficient evidence can be produced to prove the deplorable condition of these classes. It would be impossible to give an account more accurate or graphic as to the state of India and the troubles with which it is beset than is to be found in the report of Sir James Caird and Mr. Sullivan, two of the Famine Commissioners, who wrote as follows :—

" Population is increasing, the price of food is rising, the production of it as shown by the exports, scarcely advances, whilst, as the number of the landless class who depend on wages is constantly growing, the supply of labour in the absence of industries, other than agriculture must soon exceed the demand. Already their wages bear a less proportion to the price of food than in any country of which we have knowledge. The common price of grain in the southern states of America on which the free black labourer is fed, is the same as that of the Indian labourer, *viz.*, 50 to 60 lbs. per rupee. But his wages are eight times that of the Indian, 2 s. to 2s 3d against 3d a day, whilst the climate is much the same in its demands for clothing and shelter. This is a fact of extreme gravity as illustrative of the poverty of the Indian coolie or field labourer, not to be met with resting satisfied that chronic famine is one of the diseases of the infancy of nations. For India as a nation has long passed its infancy, and the task of the British Government is, by fostering diversity of occupation to guard it against decline. "

Such is the result of the observations of men who made it their special business to enquire into the condition of the country, and further on we shall find ample corroboration of these statements.

PART II.—THE EVIDENCE ADVANCED AS TO INDIA'S PROSPERITY.

The Increase of Population.—It is curious how this question of the increase of population is utilised by those who are so eager to talk about the material advancement of the country. India is growing prosperous, they say. Why ? " Look at the increase of population " they reply. Again, India is prosperous, but not as prosperous as it might be. Why ? " Look at the rate the population is increasing " is the answer promptly given. So that this increase of population serves the double purpose of acting on certain occasions as a proof of the material advancement of the country, and on other occasions as a reason for the poverty of the country. And it is amusing to find that no less distinguished a personage than the Secretary of State for India, hard pressed as he was by Sir William Wedderburn, was not above using these arguments. In February 1897 during the debate on the Address, Lord George Hamilton said :—" Whatever test you apply to India as a whole you will find that the community have prospered, and that the mass of the people are better off than was the case twenty years ago. The House is perhaps not aware that during the last twenty years the populatian of British India has increased by fifty millions. The Government of India have so managed affairs during the last twenty years that the increase of population in that country has been greater than in any other part of the world." Just

six months later when introducing the Budget, the Secretary of State for India said: "I readily admit that the advance in the material prosperity of the individual is checked by the enormous aggregate increase of the population."

Now is Lord George Hamilton correct in saying that the increase of population in India is greater than in any other part of the world? If he will be good enough to turn to page 73 of the last Census Report, he will find that India comes 20th in the list of countries having regard to the rate of increase of population. "But" says the Census Commissioner "large as this growth seems in absolute numbers, if we take it with reference to the population to which it has been superadded, it shrinks into very moderate proportions. It is but an average increase as is shown by the marginal tables, in which out of 28 countries India comes 20th." The argument as to the growing prosperity of India, based on the enormous increase of population, is therefore untenable. But if increase of population is necessarily the test of the prosperity of a country, how will Lord George Hamilton account for the fact that the rate of increase for the period 1881 to 1891 is much greater in the Feudatory States than in the British Possessions. The increase during those ten years was in British India at the rate of 9· 76 per cent., in the French and Portuguese Possessions, at 12·75 per cent., whilst in the Feudatory States, it rose to 15·52 per cent. Is the Secretary of State prepared to admit that the Feudatory States are better governed and more prosperous, because of the greater increase of their population. ?

It is just a century ago that Malthus propounded the theory that "the population invariably increases where the means of subsistence increases." The statistics of population for the last 20 years of the various countries in Europe do not however support this theory. During this period births have diminished for every twenty thousand inhabitants in France, from 26 to 23, in Switzerland from 31·3 to 27·7, in Sweden from 30·4 to 20·4, in Belgium from 31·3 to 29·3, in England from 35·1 to 33·4, in Bavaria from 37·5 to 35·9, and in Prussia from 37·9 to 37·2; yet in Italy, which is poorer than any of these countries, the births have increased to 37·6 per thousand, and shew a tendency further to increase. Thus no absolute reliance can be placed on this theory of Malthus. Indeed, says the Duke of Argyll in his article in the *Nineteenth Century* of February 1883 with reference to the increase of population in India:—

"Where there is no store, no accumulation, no wealth, where the people live from hand to mouth, from season to season, on a low diet, and where nevertheless they breed and multiply at such a rate, there we can at least see that this power and force of multiplication is no evidence even of safety, far less of comfort. It proves that, when wars are stopped and pestilences are abated, population may so swell and grow that millions and millions of men can be permanently reduced to a condition of extreme poverty and of exposure by th

ordinary vicissitudes of the season to the imminent danger of actual starvation. Thus the mere growth of numbers in any country may be no indication of prosperity, but on the contrary of weakness and of great danger."

Expansion of cultivation.—Another proof of the growing prosperity of the country, which is frequently paraded, is the increase in the area of cultivation of the land, since the introduction of British rule in India. Yes, there has been considerable expansion in this direction; but has it, and can it, keep pace with the increase in population, and is the extra land brought under the plough within the last fifty years of an equal quality to that which was previously under cultivation, and has it not to a large extent diminished the quantity of the land which used to lie fallow under the Mogul rule? Indeed, notwithstanding the increase in the area of cultivation, so great is the pressure on the land that says Sir W. Hunter in his Indian Empire (pp. 83, 84):

"In some parts of India the change in the relation of the people to the cultivable land has taken place before our own eyes. Thus in Bengal there was in the last century more cultivable land than there were husbandmen to till it. A hundred years of British rule has reversed the ratio, and there are now in some districts more people than there is land for them to till. Not only has the country been stripped of its woodlands, but in many districts the pastures have been brought under the plough, to the detriment of the cattle. The people in such districts can no longer afford to leave sufficient land fallow, or under grass, for their oxen and cows."

The Famine Commissioners writing so far back as 1880 arrived at the following conclusion:—

"On the whole then it may be said that there are considerable parts of India, such as the Burdwan and Patna Divisions of Bengal, the Benares Division, and the Lower and Middle Doab in the North-Western Provinces with parts of Rohilkund and Oude, and two or three of the most populous districts in the Punjaub—in which the population is so dense that it presses closely on the means of subsistence, and here unless the existing system of agriculture is improved, so as to yield a larger produce per acre, there can be no room for an increase of the population. Excluding these tracts there is in most villages scope for a slow and gradual extension of cultivation of what is now under tillage, and outside the village areas there is an immense extent of land which is more or less fit for cultivation. But much of it is poor land, and where it is not poor, either the climate is feverish, or else the conditions are so different from those that prevail in the densely populated places from which emigration might be desired or expected to come, that settlers would be alarmed and discouraged."

This was written in 1880; since then at least forty millions have been added to those who obtain their sustenance from the soil, so that the evil has become greatly aggravated, during the last few years.

The low incidence of taxation.—Perhaps no reason is more strongly urged to prove that India must necessarily be prosperous than is the alleged low incidence of taxation per head. It is the refuge of all who find themselves bereft of any other reason which could be urged with any show of plausibility. I doubt if there has been a Secretary of State for India who has been able to exercise sufficient restraint on himself to refrain from trotting out this pet argument. But Sir William Wedderburn and Mr.

Dadabhai Naoroji have over and over demolished the pretty story on which the superstructure of India's prosperity has been built. Sir H. Fowler, then Secretary of State for India, speaking in 1894 in the House of Commons in the debate for an inquiry into the Finances of India said :

"Now as to the revenue, I think the figures are very instructive. Whereas in England the taxation is £2-11*s*-6*d* per head, in Scotland £2-8*s*-1*d* per head, and in Ireland £1,-12*s*-3*d* per head, the budget which I shall present to-morrow will show that the taxation per head is in India something like 2*s*-6*d* per head, or 1/20th the taxation of the United Kingdom and 1/12th of that of Ireland."

Mr. S. Smith.—" Does he exclude the land revenue ?"

Mr. H. H. Fowler. " Yes. So far as the taxation of India is concerned, taking the rupee at 1*s*-1*d*, it is 2*s* 6*d* per head."

Assuming these figures to be correct the only inference that can be legitimately drawn from them is that for a country which is said to be daily growing in prosperity, it must be wretchedly poor, and as to its condition antecedent to British rule it must have been something too fearful to imagine. One feels tempted to ask if it was to relieve the suffering poor that the English merchants were first attracted to India, or is it, as their own historians say, that they came here attracted by the wealth of India.

But is it not an axiom that the weight a person can carry is regulated by his capacity for carrying it ? If then a comparison is to be made of the incidence of taxation of two countries so totally different as India and England, let us look at the income of each country so as to gauge their capacity for taxation. As Mulhall says, the real incidence of all taxation is shown by comparison with "the people's earnings." Taking the income of England at £40 per head and the taxation at £2-11*s*-8*d*, the ratio of taxation to income is 6·5 per cent., whilst, taking the official figures of the income per head in India as given by Lord Cromer and prepared by Sir D. Barfour, *viz.*, Rs. 27, the ratio of taxation to income is about 9 per cent. So that we find that a man with a wretchedly poor income has to pay about 75 per cent. more by way of taxation than the man with the larger income. Then again Sir H. Fowler excluded the land revenue when calculating the taxation per head in India. Should it have been so excluded, or at all events, should the whole of it have been excluded ?

The Real Nature of Land Tax.—It is an undoubted fact that Mill and Fawcett characterise as rent the payment made by the agriculturists to the Government, whom these writers put in the position of a landlord. That some portion of this payment comes rightly within the category of rent cannot be denied, but unfortunately in practice we find the Government taking for its share an amount much greater than would fall under the description of rent. Sir C. Wood in 1861 fixed 50 per cent. of the net produce as ordinarily

claimable on account of the Government demand. What as a matter of fact is taken, is something very different. Sir Bartle Frere describes the assessment in the Bombay Presidency as coming within the three following economic classes: (1) a land tax fixed more or less arbitrarily, and absorbing a varying proportion of the true rent; (2) a full rent leaving nothing to the cultivator but the wages of his labour, and the interest on his capital; and (3) a rent and something more, trenching on the wages of labour or the profits of capital. To these three classes Sir Louis Mallet adds a fourth: "I am also informed" he says, "that in many cases lands have been assessed which barely pay the cost of cultivation and yield no rent at all." And says Sir William Wedderburn: "To these four classes I must regretfully add yet a fifth and still more grievous case, where the total crop is insufficient to pay the cost of cultivation, and where the assessment must be paid out of wages earned elsewhere or from cash obtained from the money-lender." And Sir William Wedderburn in the Budget Debate of 1894 gave the then Secretary of State for India sufficient particulars to satisfy even the most unbelieving of official minds. The precise nature of the payment made by the Indian land holder to the Government is elaborately discussed on page 183 part II of the Indian Famine Commission Report by Mr, Sullivan, one of the Commissioners, who earnestly protests "against the process of reasoning by which it is sought to uphold the theory put forward by Mr Wilson that the land revenue of India is of the nature of rent, and is not raised by taxation; and he arrives at the conclusion that the state is not the owner of the land, and therefore the people cannot be its tenants, nor can the share of the produce of the land which they contribute towards the public necessity be designated rent. It is therefore a tax, and as such must be taken into account in calculating the incidence of taxation." That other authorities of repute take this view is evident from the fact that Mulhall in his Dictionary of Statistics puts the incidence of taxation for India at 5*s*. per head. At all events, if even a portion of it be reckoned as such, and added to the amount from which Sir H. Fowler made the calculation of taxation per head as amounting to 2s 6d, it will be found that proportionately to the income, the people of India pay almost twice as much per head as taxation as do those of England, the richer country. We willsee later on, when discussing the causes of the impoverishment of the ryot, that the stringency of the land revenue has played a considerable part in contributing towards it.

The Heavy Imports of Precious Metals.—Another stock argument of those who advocate the theory of the growing prosperity of India is based on the influx of what they allege to be enormous quantities of gold and silver. No less a distinguished person than Lord Welby, the President of the Royal

Commission on Indian Expenditure, on Sir James Peile, a Member of the Commission, pointing out that within the 30 years ending March 1892, India had received and retained 356 millions of bullion, remarked that, "the fact of these large amounts pouring into India shows that India as a whole was not decreasing in wealth." Assuming these figures to be correct, what is their real significance? Though the aggregate amount seems enormous, it has to be divided amongst a population which is no less enormous, about 300 millions at the present day. This would give a little over five annas (say six pence) per annum per head. Surely not a very striking evidence of the aggregate wealth of the country. But there is no doubt that some portion of this imported treasure has gone across the frontier territories in return for their merchandise, which was paid for partly in merchandise and partly in gold and silver. The Native States absorbed more than a fair share of the precious metals, for, having no foreign payments to make, they, for the opium, grain and other articles exported by them, received in return hard cash, after deducting the value of the Manchester cloth which they imported, Then again has any calculation been made of the gold and silver, which the Rajahs and Nabobs in British territory, the wealthy Zamindars, the rich Mahajanas and merchants, and some members of the professional and trading classes, have appropriated to their use, and have either turned into ornaments or are hoarding as bullion? What benefit then does the agriculturist derive from this? Making a deduction on all these accounts, what is the value of the precious metals left for the bulk of the population of India, the peasantry, with whom alone we are concerned at present? Surely it is not drawing a forced conclusion to say that whilst the few are accumulating this gold and silver, the multitude of the people is sinking into greater poverty.

The Expanding Commerce.—Speaking in the House of Commons in March 1895, Sir H. Fowler alluded with great satisfaction to the growing commerce of India, as indicative of its prosperity. He said, "dealing with the value of merchandise imported into and exported from British India, I find that in the year 1892-1893, which was not a particularly prosperous year, India bought £ 79,000,000 sterling worth of merchandise, and India sold £ 113,000,000 worth." The amount in figures is indeed enormous and is gradually increasing, for in 1895-96 the imports came up to £ 82, 676, 380, and the exports to £ 118, 495, 441 sterling, but the increase is of a kind which any petty merchant or trader, set aside a student in political economy, would say was scarcely conducive to the welfare and prosperity of India. Supposing a merchant were to sell every year produce of the value of £ 100, but received only £ 70 in

return. How would he be able to balance his accounts and how long would he remain solvent? India is precisely in this position. According to Sir H. Fowler India received in the year 1893 as the price of the produce it exported an amount that was short by £ 34,000,000, and in 1895 according to Mr. O' Conor the Director General of Statistics the difference rose to about £ 36,000,000. What became of the rest of the money? A part went in the payment of Home Charges, another part towards the payment of the sterling debt, and a third part on account of remittances by merchants and private persons. India is like a mortgaged country burdened with a heavy debt. It has no manufactures of its own, and it therefore tries to liquidate its debt by the sale of the produce of the land. Sometimes it is unable to pay its yearly instalment and then a benevolent Government comes forward and borrows on its account in the country of payment, thus tiding over a temporary difficulty, but increasing its permanent liability. Some portion of the produce of the land which is exported is no doubt of great economic value, for it consists of articles in excess of the requirements of the country, such as indigo, tea, coffee, jute &c., but the export of food grains is indeed anything but a blessing. If the people were sufficiently fed and could spare from their well-furnished garners grain which was not required for their own wants, this barter of their food would not be open to objection. But so far back as 1880, two of the Famine Commissioners, Sir James Caird, and Mr. H. E. Sullivan recorded their opinion, as follows :—

But the export of food grain other than rice from India during each of the last ten years has been less than one day's consumption of the grain eating population. There would thus appear to be no sufficient annual surplus within the country to meet the demand of grain famine, without drawing part of their ordinary food from the unaffected districts, thereby diminishing their supply, raising the price and thus extending the area and general pressure of the famine. Supplies from foreign countries are practically impossible.—*Famine Commission* Report. PART I. p. 67.

Sir James Caird in his official report to the Secretary of State for India dated 31st October 1879, stated that :—

" The produce of the country on a average of years is barely sufficient to maintain the present population, and make a saving for occasional famine-scarcity deepening into famine is thus becoming of more frequent occurrence."

This was written nearly twenty years ago, and since then, there are fifty millions more mouths to feed. It will therefore be seen how far this export of grain is natural and beneficial, and how far it is enforced by the exigency of the situation, and hence prejudicial to the interests of the people.

PART III.—EVIDENCE AS TO INDIA'S POVERTY.

The Evidence of English Statesmen & Anglo-Indian officials.

John Bright, 1853 :-

Speaking of India in the House of Commons he said, "What is it, that the people of India, if they spoke by my mouth, have to complain of? They would tell the House that as a rule, throughout almost all the Presidencies, and throughout those Presidencies most, which have been longest under British rule, the cutivators of the soil, the great body of the population of India, are in a condition of great impoverishment, of great dejection, and of great suffering."

Lord Lawrence, 1864 :—

"India is on the whole a very poor country. The mass of the population enjoy only a scanty subsistence." And again, "The mass of the people were so miserably poor that they had barely the means of subsistence."

Lord Mayo, 1870 :—

"I admit the comparative poverty of this country as compared with many other countries of the same magnitude and importance, and I am convinced of the impolicy and injustice of imposing burdens upon this people which may be called either crushing or oppressive. Mr. Grant Duff in an able speech which he delivered the other day in the House of Commons, the report of which arrived by the last mail stated with truth that the position of our finance was wholly different from that of England. 'In England' he stated, "you have comparatively a wealthy population. The income of the United Kingdom has, I believe, been guessed at £ 800,000,000 per annum; the income of British India has been guessed at £ 300,000,000 per annum; that goes well on a to £ 30 per annum as the income of every person in the United Kingdom, and only £ 2 per annum as the income of every person in British India.' I believe Mr. Grant Duff had good grounds for the statement he made, and I wish to say with reference to it that we are perfectly cognisant of the relative poverty of this country as compared with European states.

Sir James Caird, 1879 :—

One of the members of the Famine Commission in his official Report to the Secretary of State for India says: "The produce of the country on an average of years is barely sufficient to maintain the present population, and make a saving for occasional famine. An exhausting agriculture and an increasing population must come to a deadlock."

Mr. H. C. Irmu, 1880 :—

Of the Bengal Civil Service, states in his "Garden of India:" "While the millions suffer from chronic hunger it would be as easy to make a pyramid stand upon its apex as to regenerate them by ornamental legislation or by anything but putting them beyond the ceaseless pressure of physical want".

1880 Mr. A. O Hume :—

Secretary to the Government of India in the Agricultural Department, in his report to Government on the abolition of that office says: "Except in very good seasons, multitudes for months in every year cannot get sufficient food for themselves and their families. They are not starving, but they are hungry; they get less than they want and that they ought to have."

Mr. Robert Knight, 1880 :—

A distinguished Anglo-Indian Journalist, who spent 30 years in India writes, "What the Government and the people of England have to wake up to is the fact that instead of British rule having enriched the people of India, it has reduced the masses of them to a poverty so abject as to be nearly incredible."

Sir William Hunter, 1881 :—

Being at that time Director General of Statistics under the Government of India stated in his book, 'England's Work in India,' that—" Forty millions of the people of India habitually go through life on insufficient food."

Lord Cromer, 1882 :—

Then Finance Minister, in introducing the Budget in the Council, said, "It has been calculated that the average income per head of population in India is not more than Rs. 27 a year, and though I am not prepared to pledge myself to the absolute accuracy of a calculation of this sort, it is sufficiently accurate to justify the conclusion that the tax-paying community is *exceedingly poor*. I would ask honourable members to think, whether Rs. 27 per annum was sufficient to support a person, and then would ask whether a few annas was nothing to such poor people."

The Duke of Argyll, 1883 :—

In an article in the, *Nineteenth Century*, on the Economic condition of the Highlands said. "We know indeed of poverty and of destitution more or less numerous examples in European countries. "But of chronic poverty and of permanent reduction to the lowest level of subsistence such as prevail only too widely among the vast populations of rural India, we have no example in the Western World."

Sir H. J. S. Cotton, 1885 :—

The present Chief Commissioner of Assam in his book 'New India' says, "The ryots cry aloud for bread, and we have given them a volume of new laws to comfort them. The statute book grows exeedingly. From an object of wonder it has become an object of suspicion and distrust."

Sir Charles Elliott, 1888 :—

Writing as Chief Commissioner of Assam said, "I do not hesitate to say that half the agricultural population do not know from one year's end to another what it is to have a full meal."

Sir William Wedderburn, 1897 :—

Ex-Member of the Bombay Council, stated in the Budget Debate in the House of Commons, "The ryots as a class were in a condition of deep destitution. Had they possessed a reasonable store of food, of money, or of credit, they would have been able to tide over at least one failure of harvest. But the experience of the famine showed that they were not able to do this. As a rule they not only possessed nothing, but much less than nothing, being hopelessly indebted to the money-lenders."

The statement of Sir William Hunter as to forty millions going through life without sufficient food having attracted the attention of Parliament, the then Secretary of State directed the Government of India to institute an enquiry into the general condition of the ryots. This was done through the

District Officers, each Local Government giving its own views, and the whole of it being reviewed by a Resolution of the Government of India, dated 24th October 1888. These various reports were then printed and presented to Parliament in the form o f a Blue Book. They contain ample material to confirm the views of Sir William Hunter, and but for lack of space the observations of some of the officers would have been quoted here.

The Indebtednesses of the Agricultural Classes.—Surely there can be no fairer test as to the condition of a person than the fact as to whether he is solvent or not. If in every day life we come across an individual who, we discover, is in debt and is daily increasing his debt, would we call him a prosperous man ? Scarcely so ; and the same principles ought surely to apply to an aggregate of individuals, or to a community. We have seen that the community of those who derive their living from the soil, constitutes 90 per cent. of the population of India. Is this class taken as a whole free from debt and solvent ? Let official evidence decide the matter. The Famine Commissioners write in their Report :—

" We learn from evidence collected from all parts of India that above one-third of the land holding class are deeply and inextricably in debt, and that at least an equal proportion are in debt though not beyond the power of recovering themselves". As to the ryots in the Bombay Presidency they say, " As indebtedness became more hopeless and inextricable, the money-lenders resorted more freely to the aid of legal processes, and the debtors exasperated at the invasion of their cherished rights in their holdings were driven to despair, and finally on several occasions to rioting and violence. The proportion of land-owners seriously embarrassed does not appear to exceed 30 per cent., but the amount of debt in proportion to income is heavier than that stated to exist in other provinces, and about two-thirds of the debt is secured by mortgage of the land."

Under the recommendation of a Commission specially appointed in 1879, the Deccan Agriculturists Relief Act was passed in that year to afford the peasant, protection against the money-lender. In 1892 another Commission was appointed to inquire into the working of this Act, and the Commissioners reported that though the condition of the ryots was in some respects more hopeful, "yet the fact remains that a large and increasing area is still being annually transferred from the cultivating to the trading and other classes." How far the ryots of Madras are indebted will be seen from the figures supplied by Lord George Hamilton a few months ago in reply to a question put in the House of Commons by Sir William Wedderburn.

	Seven years. 1887—94.	Two years. 1894—96.
Defaulters whose land was sold ...	56,648.	14,411.
Defaulters whose personal property was sold...	55,772.	6717.

By reference to the Administration Reports it appears that from 1882-1883 to 1891-92 there were 4,495,432 sales and mortgages of immoveable

property, and the number was yearly increasing, for whereas in 1882-83 there were 314, 948 sales and mortgages, in 1891-92 the number was no less than 608,907. In 1896—97 while the number of holdings large and small was 3,376,729, the number of coerive processes issued was 5,816,226, property was attached in 230,487 cases and 21,467 acres of land were sold for recovery of arrears.

In the Central Provinces the indebtedness of the agriculturists has reached such an acute stage that there is a Bill before the Government of India with a clause abrogating the power of transfer conferred on occupancy and ordinary tenants in 1883. On the 28th October 1896, the Chief Commissioner of those Provinces wrote, "With exhausted stocks, deficient harvests, and the pressure of a load of debt, which had steadily grown during the succession of unfavorable years, it is not surprising that t h feeling of the agricultural population should be one of great despondency, almost of despair, and that the position of the landless classes should cause the gravest anxiety.

In the North Western Provinces, the coercive processes rose from 71,000 to 750,000 in 1894-95, the attachment of property for arrears from 7016 to 9642. The number of suits and applications under the rent law was 271,592 or 3 per cent. above the total of 1892-93, and was larger than in any previous year. Of the suits, over 90 per cent. were, as in previous years, for arrears of rent. In the Berars there was an increase of 50 per cent. in the coercive processes issued for the year, they having risen to 15638 writs of demand as against 10324 of the previous year.

But it is said the indebetedness of the agriculturist is due to his extravagance in marriage and other festivals. What truth there is in this allegation will be seen from a para to be found in the report of the Deccan Riots Commission—p 19. par 54.

"The results of the Commission's inquiries show that undue prominence has been given to the expenditure on marriage and other festivals as a cause of the ryots' indebtedness. The expenditure on such occasions may undoubtedly be called extravagant when compared with the ryot's means; but the occasions occur seldom, and probably in a course of years the total sum spent this way by any ryot is not larger than a man in his position is justified in spending on social and domestic pleasures". Sir D. Barbour in his evidence before the Royal Expenditure Commission described the Indian people as "most frugal and economical."

"The reason is not" wrote Mr. Romesh Chunder Dutt, in his article in the *Fortnightly Review August* 1897, "a want of frugality or of sobriety, or of prudence. The Indian peasant is the most sober, the most frugal, and the most prudent peasant on the face of the earth. The reason

is that at each settlement, the rent payable by him is increased and his capacity to save decreased. The reason is that, with no savings of his own he goes to the money-lender under every pressure, and our Civil Courts with their hard-and-fast rules only cast him deeper into the meshes of the grasping money-lender. The reason is that in every petty dispute, Civil and Criminal, he is compelled to have recourse to distant and expensive law courts. The reason is that he has to pay many taxes in order to maintain England's Empire in Asia."

Further on, the cause of the impoverishment and indebtedness of the agriculturists will be more fully discussed.

Small Income and Stationary Wages.—Sir D. Barbour, the late Finance Minister of India, when giving his evidence before Lord Welby's Commission advanced certain tests to gauge the economic condition of India. He said "If anybody wants to convince himself that the income of the people of India is small—the average income per head of population—and will look first at all the tables of wages which I think are published by the Indian Government, and then look at the results of the Income-tax in India, he will satisfy himself that the money income of the people is very small indeed. I know of that being the fact." We have already seen that Lord Cromer puts the income per head at Rs. 27. Sir Richard Temple had in a paper read by him in 1881 before the Institute of Bankers arrived at the conclusion that it was Rs. 10 per head, and this says Sir D. Barbour led him to go into the consideration of this question, with the result that his calculations showed the income per head to be Rs. 27, which he communicated to the then Finance Minister, Lord Cromer. Let us take some other authorities:—

Sir H. S. Cunninghan one of the Famine Commissioners estimates that the labourer gets a wage from 2 pence a day, or in other cases 3*s*. or 4*s*. a month.

Mr. Robertson the late Agricultural Reporter to the Government of Madras, speaking of the Indian peasant says, "In the best seasons the gross income of himself and his family does not exceed 3d per day throughout the year, and in a bad season their circumstances are most deplorable."

Mr. Holderness the present Secretary of the Government of India in the Revenue Department when in the North Western Provinces wrote as follows:—

"The united earnings of a man, his wife, and two children cannot be put at more than Rs. 3 per month. When prices of food grains are moderate, work regular, and the health of the household good, this income will enable the family to have one good meal a day, to keep a thatched roof over their head, to buy cheap cotton clothing, and occasionally a thin blanket. The small cultivator is slightly better off, but he has not always enough to eat, or sufficiently warm clothes."

Sir Auckland Colvin, a former Finance Minister of India speaking in 1885 in the Council said:—

"The masses of the people are men whose income at the best is so barely sufficient to afford them the necessary sustenence to support life, living as they do on the barest necessaries of life."

The Collector of Patna (Behar) writing in 1887 with reference to the agricultural labourers said :—

"They are almost always paid in kind, the usual allowance of a grown man 2 to 2½ seers of the coarsest and cheapest grain, value about 2¼ annas (2¼d). Women secure about half this rate, but their employment is less regular. Ordinarily male labourers do not find employment for more than eight months in the year. The conclusion to be drawn is that, of the agricultural population, a large proportion say 40 per cent. are insufficiently fed, to say nothing of clothing and housing."

It is needless citing any further authorities, but a glance at the receipts from the Income-tax will show how poor India must be. In the United Kingdom 1*d.* in the income-tax gave some £2,500,000 ; but in India with nearly ten times the population 1*d.* only gave Rx. 300,000 with an exemption of only Rx. 50 instead of £150 as in this country.

But it might be argued that wages are now on the increase. In industrial centres where an impetus has been given to local manufactures by the establishment of factories, there has been a rise in the daily wage. But what are these few workmen compared with the mass of the labourers who obtain a living from the soil. There can be no higher authority on this subject than Sir James Caird one of the Famine Commissioners. He says :—

"Though wages have risen at the centres of industry, this is not the case in the purely agricultural parts of the country. In such localities the labourer gets the same dole that he got in the last generation. The numbers of such people are increasing, and their condition is becoming every ten years more desperate."

If any one interested in the subject will turn up the pages of the "Ayeen Akbari" by Abulfazal he will find that the wages of workmen and artificers and the income of the soldiers and labourers is the same now that it was three hundred years ago.

And yet, it is an admitted fact that prices are now three times, and in some cases four times as high as they were in the time of the Mogal Emperors. Every decade witnesses a considerable rise of prices. General Brackenbury, the military member of the Viceroy's Council, speaking in the Budget debate in 1895 said :—

"I find that the price of rice has risen 38 per cent. between 1884 and 1892 on the average of Madras and Rangoon ; wheat, which we have taken for seven stations has risen 72 per cent. between 1884 and 1892 ; barley, which is one of our most important items as food for horses, has risen 85 per cent between 1884 and 1892 ; and the price of gram has increased 49 per cent between 1884 and 1892, taking such stations as Cawnpore, Delhi, Rawalpandi, and Karrachi.

Thus we can realise what the condition of the poor labourer and

artificer must be when food prices have trebled themselves whilst their income or daily wages are the same:

The Inelasticity of the Revenue.—Allusion has been made before to the fact that the Mogal Emperors exacted a very heavy Revenue from their subjects; but what is its true significance? With a population which has doubled itself, with a considerable expansion in the area of cultivation, with the exports and imports aggregating enormous figures, with a Government at once stable and humane and with the incessant official cry that is raised as to the material prosperty of the people, we have to face this fact that whilst the Revenue raised is less than that exacted by the Mogal Emperors, the most competent authorities declare the burden borne by the people is so heavy that there is no margin left for deriving an increased amount from additional taxation. If the people are really better of now than they were before, it necessarily follows that their capacity for bearing increased taxation is necessarily greater, but what is it we find, that though in number they are double what they were in former times, yet they do not pay anything like the same Revenue, and what is worse they are in such a state, that there is no prospect of anything more being extracted out of them. A few authorities cited at random will show what elasticity there is in the Indian Revenue.

John Bright speaking in Birmingham in 1879 said:—

"The taxation as I have said is oppressive, and oppressive to such a degree that all the authorities in India say you cannot turn the screw any more, and that if you do, something worse than a deficient revenue may follow."

Mr. Fawcett:—

"The great mass of her people are in such a state of impoverishment that the Government will have to contend with exceptional difficulties, if it becomes necessary to procure increased revenue by additional taxation."

Lord Ripon:—

"The difficulty of finding new sources of taxation without resorting to measures that might be oppressive is always present. The finances of India are inelastic, and you have little to look to in the way of increase from ordinary taxation."

Sir David. Barbour:—

"There is no big tax left now which is not open either to great objections, or which would not excite great discontent. I think we have put on pretty well all the taxation that could be put on, without its becoming a very serious matter."

Lord George Hamilton:—

"But India is not self-contained as to expenditure, and the Indian Government is not in possession of a reserve of taxation".

The *Times*, September 1896:—

"We should not forget that India has to maintain her solvency, and to pay for her

peace and prosperity by a taxation which her Imperial and Provincial financiers alike declare to have reached the limits of safety."

The *Pioneer*, 12th April 1898 :—

"We have virtually tapped every important source of taxation : we have had if we mistake not, nine deficits in the twenty years, and though we scrape through with a balance, nobody can see where the money would come from in another twenty years to meet our expenditure increasing at the rate of the last decade : we shall ultimately fail to pay our way, and shall again as in 1880 be drawn to accept a subvention from the Imperial Parliament."

The Deterioration and Exhaustion of the Soil.—Twenty years ago Sir James Caird drew attention to the danger attending the exhaustion of the soil. "Crop follows crop without intermission" he wrote in his Report as Famine Commissioner, "so that Indian agriculture is becoming simply a process of exhaustion." It will be said this is the fault of the peasant who is oblivious or indifferent to the simple working of the laws of nature. If he is to be blamed for blindly compassing his own ruin, he can plead that he acts under compulsion, for his foolish acts are prompted by the cravings of hunger, and the dictates of humanity to save his wife and children from famishing. From the inexorable laws which demand the due payment of the Government demand, he must either seek relief at the hands of the money-lender or try his best to extract what he can from his holding. Mr. A. O. Hume, the Secretary to the Government of India in the Agricultural Department in 1870 made the following pointed remarks as to the exhaustion of the soil :—

"Agriculture in India has become, and becomes daily, more and more what Leibig happily designated a system of spoliation. Deep as the purse may have been, and rich as much of our soil unquestionably was, it is clear that a time must arrive when, by continually taking out a great deal, and putting back very little, both purse and soil are exhausted. Unlike the European peasant, the Indian husbandman more or less fully realises the evils of this system ; it is only on compulsion that he robs his mother soil, and it is only in comparatively quite recent times that this spoliation has acquired alarming intensity that now characterises it. Only fifty years ago, when jungles and grazing grounds abounded, when cattle were more numerous, when much wood was available as fuel, there was actually a much greater amount of manure available, and a very much smaller number of fields on which to spread it. The evil is a growing one, it is one of gigantic magnitude, and though like all great causes, it operates slowly, no one who has really watched agriculture for years in this country, can doubt that its effects are already showing far and wide ; no one who understands the question can doubt that they will develop with most disastrously increasing virulence as years run on."

"It is its own land that Government is allowing to go to ruin, its own financial blood that it lets run to waste. This is the sole goose that ever would or could lay golden eggs for us, and we are smiling as it is slowly starved before us, and will not make a single effort worthy of the name to arrest the catastrophe."

Part IV.—The Cause of India's Poverty.

The Destruction of Industries. India, as has been noticed before, is now a purely agricultural country, but it has become so only within recent times. "From the earliest days" says Sir William Hunter "India has been a trading country. The industrial genius of her inhabitants, even more than her natural wealth and her extensive seaboard, distinguished her from other Asiatic lands." "From the times of the Romans" writes Sir Alfred Lyall "to our own times, Indian trade has drained the gold and silver of Europe." What did this trade consist of? Not of food grains, or other agricultural products, but of commodities manufactured in the country, and which only this country could then produce.

"The gossamer muslins of Dacca, beautiful shawls of Cashmere and the brocaded silks of Delhi adorned the proudest beauties at the courts of the Cæsars, when the barbarians of Britain were painted savages. Embossed and filigree metals, elaborate carvings in ivory, ebony and sandal wood; brilliant dyed chintzes, diamonds, uniquely-set pearls and precious stones, embroidered velvets and carpets; highly wrought steel, excellent porcelain, and perfect naval architecture—were for ages the admiration of civilised mankind, and before London was known in history, India was the richest trading mark of the earth."

(Martin's Indian Empire Vol I. p. 508.)

Till the advent of the English, India retained its supremacy as a manufacturing country; but where are now its industries and manufactures? Where are the cotton and silk fabrics which were famed all over the world?

"Many circumstances conspired" says Sir William Hunter " to injure the Indian industry in the last century England excluded these fabrics not by fiscal duties, but by absolute prohibition. A change of fashion in the West Indies on the abolition of slavery took away the best customer left to India. Then came cheapness of production in Lancashire, due to improvements in machinery. Lastly the high price of raw cotton during the American War, however beneficial to the cultivators, fairly broke down the local weaving trade in the cotton growing tracts. The far-famed muslins of Dacca and of Arni are now well-nigh lost specialities. The finer fabrics of cotton which from Surat at the beginning of the century were exported to the value of Rx. 360,000 a year dropped to the paltry sum of Rx. 6,332 in 1874. And whilst on the one hand the downfall of the native courts deprived the skilled workman of his chief market, on the other hand, the English capitalist has enlisted in his service forces of nature against which the village artisans in vain try to compete. The tide of circumstance has compelled the Indian weaver to exchange his loom for the plough, and has crushed many of the minor handicrafts."

In the year 1894-95 India imported, deducting the value of that which it exported, cotton goods and yarn of the value of Rx. 25,000,000, and silk, raw and manufactured, of the value of Rx. 2,000,000. Now supposing all these cotton and silk fabrics had been manufactured in India, one can hardly conceive the extent to which they would have afforded employment

to the people of the country. It is not as if it were merely that the export of Indian manufactures has been stifled, but unfortunately, for their personal use, Indian people to a large extent have now to depend on foreign manufactures instead of looking to the local industries to supply their wants. There was a time when India supplied its own varied demands—its food grains were enough for the wants of the people ; salt could then, and can even now, but for its heavy duty, be had in abundance; the millions of hand-looms that were at work manufactured cotton and silk cloths enough and to spare ; the arms, ammunition and accoutrements required not only for an immense army, but for the people at large, for in those days there was no restriction as to the carrying of arms, were all the products of local industry ; the hundred and one requirements of the higher classes whose luxury knew no bounds, were readily met by artificers, whose exquisite work has never been equalled in these matter-of fact-days of steam and machinery.

Loss of Employment by Indians.—The introduction of British rule in India has necessitated the employment of a large number of men who are foreigners to the country. And herein lies the difference between the English and the other conquerors who came to India. The latter settled down in this country, and made it their home. They freely employed the natives of India in administering its affairs, and raised them to the highest civil and military posts. The Prime Minister of Akbar and some of his bravest generals were Hindoos, and his army was entirely recruited from the country. But what do we find under British rule? Thousands of men who held high administrative posts have been displaced, and hundreds of thousands of those who would in former times have obtained employment as soldiers or retainers in the houses of princes and nobles find their occupation gone. These have all to fall back on agriculture for a living. Bernier gives a graphic account as to how the enormous revenue of the Mogul Emperors was spent :—

"I have known many persons lost in amazement while contemplating the number of persons amounting to millions who depend for support solely on the king's pay. Is it possible, they have asked, that any revenue can suffice for such incredible expenditure, seeming to forget the riches of the Great Mogul, and the peculiar manner in which Hindustan is governed."

"The effective cavalry commonly about the king's person, including that of the Rajahs and Patans, amounted to thirty five or forty thousand, which, added to those in the Provinces, formed a total of more than two hundred thousand horse. Including the followers the army immediately about the king's person, particularly when it is known that he means to absent himself for some time from the capital, may amount to two or even three hundred thousand infantry. The army stationed in the provinces differs in nothing from that about the king's person, except in its superior numbers. In every district there are Oomrahs, Mansabdars, common troopers, infantry and artillery. The foot soldiers received a salary ranging from

twenty five to ten rupees a month, the common troopers not less than Rs. 25 a month, whilst the artillery men received Rs. 35 per month. It is difficult to find in the Mogul army a soldier who is not married, who has not wife, children and slaves all depending on him for support. The Oomrahs kept up large establishments and maintained the splendour of the court, in so far that they were in embarrassed circumstances owing to the extravagance of their tables and their large establishments of wives, servants, camels and horses."

Not only have most of these employments vanished at the present time, but as a result of a foreign domination the highly paid appointments are held by foreigners who spend their savings and enjoy their pensions out of the country.

The Employment of Europeans.—About fifteen years ago Mr. Bright moved for and obtained a return showing the number of Europeans employed in India, and in 1892 Mr. Seymour Keay obtained an extended return made up to date, which on several occasions he made use of in the House of Commons. From this return it appears that there were in that year 28,000 Europeans who received a salary of Rs. 1,000 a year and over, and that their aggregate salary amounted to no less a sum than Rs. 154,000,000. Of this enormous sum Rs. 60,000,000 were remitted to be spent in England in the shape of pensions; that is to say that 40 per cent. of the whole of the amount disbursed in salaries of over 1,000 rupees a year to Europeans, was remitted and paid in England. From the same return it appears that there were 17,000 Indians drawing a salary of Rs. 1,000 and upwards a year, and their aggregate salary amounted to only Rs. 32,000,000 a year, so that the non-effective Europeans living in England actually drew nearly double the amount paid to the whole of the natives of India employed in the service. The serious significance of the enormous outlay in the employment of Europeans in India was recognised by the then Secretary of State for India who in a letter addressed to the Treasury (Ret. C. 4868 of 1886) stated:—

"The position of India in relation to taxation and the sources of the public revenue is very peculiar, not merely from the habits of the people, and their strong aversion to change, which is more especially exhibited to new forms of taxation, but likewise from the character of the Government, which is in the hands of foreigners, who hold the principal administrative offices, and form so large a part of the army. The impatience of the new taxation which will have to be borne wholly as a consequence of the foreign rule imposed on the country, and virtually to meet additions to charges arising outside of the country, would constitute a political danger, the real magnitude of which it is to be feared is not at all appreciated by persons who have no knowledge of, or concern in, the Government of India, but which those responsible for that Government have long regarded as of the most serious order."

The Annual Drain—Perhaps if there is one cause which operates more than another in undermining the prosperity of the country, it is the annual drain which is continually in progress. For, says, Professor Thorold Rogers, "if the community is doing well, the imports are always in excess of exports, when interpreted in money value or prices." We have seen at an earlier page that

here is a great discrepancy between the value of the exports and the imports, to the disadvantage of India and a casual allusion has been made to the causes which have brought this about. By reference to the statistics relating to European countries we find that the imports invariably exceed the exports. The excess of imports is as follows: England, 32 per cent.; Denmark, 40 per cent.; Switzerland, 28 per cent.; Norway, 42 per cent.; Holland, 22 per cent; Sweden, 24 per cent.; France, 20 per cent.; Spain, 9 per cent.; Belgium, 7 per cent. But what is the case with India? There was a time when, for the productions it exported, it received payment in gold and silver, and even under British rule it did so, partially if not wholly.

Fawcett in his Manual of Political Economy p. 497 says:—

"India formerly absorbed far more silver than any other country. During the eight years previous to 1867 the annual import of silver into India in excess of the export was £ 15,000,000. During the next four years it declined to an annual average of rather more than £ 7,000,000, and during the last ten years it has averaged somewhat less than £ 4,500,000. It would therefore appear from these figures that India some years since absorbed far more silver than the amount annually produced and consequently her demand for silver was partly met by drawing upon the silver currencies of France and other countries which had a silver standard."

But of late years though the value of the produce exported is gradually increasing there has not been a proportionate rise in the value of what is received in return, in precious metals, or for the matter of that, in merchandise.*

The Effects of the Annual Drain.—What is the precise significance of this excess of exports over imports will be seen by the following quotations from John Stuart Mill's Political Economy:—

"The result is that a country which makes regular payments to foreign countries, besides losing what it pays, loses also something more, by the less advantageous terms on which it is forced to exchange its productions for foreign commodities."

"International payments for which no equivalent in commodities or money is paid have all the effects of a tribute."

"The paying country will give a higher price for all that it buys from the receiving country, while the latter, besides receiving the tribute, obtains the exportable produce of the tributary country at a lower price."

India is therefore paying a heavy tribute to England, and the evil is aggravated by the fact that it is such a poor country. A country in a high state of industrial development would not feel the loss so much. France, when it was suddenly called upon to pay after an expensive war thousands of millions of francs as a war indemnity to Germany, did not find its resources crippled, because it was a prosperous country possessing every mechanical and scientific aid for augmenting its productive powers. But

* On this point read Mr. Mudholkar's article on the Economic condition of the people of India.

India, with its cultivation carried on in a fashion in vogue a thousand years ago, and with neither the will nor the power to improve on those methods, is letting out, as it were, its heart's blood, and is growing weaker and more infirm every day, and its people are languishing under the effects of a system which leaves them insufficiently fed. Mr. J. M. Maclean is a staunch Conservative member of Parliament and no sympathiser of the Indian National Congress, whilst he possesses a unique knowledge of India derived by a long residence in Bombay as one of the leading journalists. In the Budget debate of 1895 he thus described the condition of India:—

"All the taxes were paid by the industrious traders and merchants of the plains, and nearly the whole of the revenue was spent away from them. Of the fifty millions of revenue, fully one half went to England and a very large proportion of the remainder was spent upon troops and expeditions on the frontier, so that the money did not go back to the people who paid the taxes at all. This showed the fallacy of such calculations as were given in the explanatory statement issued this year by the late Secretary of State for India. The Right Hon'ble gentleman there spoke of the small burden of taxation in India. It might appear small, but there was this difference between the taxation in England and that in India;- the former was all spent within the limits of the country to stimulate trade and industry; but as regards India it was, almost to the extent of three fourths of the whole, spent out of the country in which it was raised. This was because in England, the Treasury was supreme over all departments, while in India the Treasury was practically helpless. The Government of India was really a military despotism, and the Treasury had only one member in the council. All the other members might be trusted to act together on questions of Imperial policy. There was no representative of the trade and industry, the culture and intelligence of the country, the members lived for the greater part of the year away in the hills at Simla and were utterly out of touch with public opinion. They were like the Olympian deities of whom Tennyson wrote:—

There they live and lie reclined,
On the hills like gods together, careless of mankind.

The possession of India has been of inestimable advantage to us, but how long should we retain India if we did not maintain sound finance there, and see that the people were lightly taxed?."

So far back as 1790 Lord Cornwallis wrote in a Despatch that "the heavy drain of wealth by the Company with the addition of remittances of private fortunes was severely felt in the languor thrown upon the cultivation and commerce of the country."

On the other hand, though the Mogul Emperors for upwards of one hundred years realised perhaps a larger sum by way of taxation than does the British Government now, the people were able to meet the demands made on them, for the money so realised remained in the country and was spent on them. Bernier who travelled in India during the reigns of Jehangir and Aurangazeb says:—

"Thus although the great Mogul be in the receipt of an immense revenue, his expenditure

being much in the same proportion, he cannot possess the vast surplus of wealth that most people seem to imagine. I admit that his income exceeds probably the joint revenues of the Grand Seignior and of the King of Persia; but if I were to call him a wealthy monarch, it would be in the sense that a treasurer is considered wealthy who pays with one hand the large sums that he receives with the other"

The Absence of Economic Drain in Native States.—It has been pointed out on a preceding page that beyond a small tribute they pay to the Government of India, the Native states receive in full the value of the productions they export. They have no foreign debt on which they have to pay interest, but on the contrary, some of them, such as Gwalior, have made foreign investments, and the subjects of a great many States have laid out their spare cash in British securities, for which they draw interest. The revenues of the States are spent within their respective territories, and not drained out in the payment of pensions of a large foreign service. They are perhaps but indifferently governed, at least no English official will admit that they are as well governed as British India, yet we have this remarkable fact before us, that their subjects are in a better condition than their neighbours under English rule. If we take the test of increase of population, we have already noticed that the increase in the Feudatory States is almost double that in British territory. Again look at the incidence of taxation, taking Mysore as an example. Sir H. Fowler in 1894 in the debate on the motion to enquire into the condition of India stated as follows:—

"The argument is that the administration of India by England is costly and intolerable and that native administration would be economical and popular. We have to the southwest of India one of the most influential and prosperous of the Native States, the state of Mysore. It is surrounded by Madras. The conditions of life in the two districts are practically the same. The population of Mysore is 5,000,000; in Madras it is 35,000,000, or seven times more. Mysore, moreover is administered by an able and businesslike representative body. Now in Mysore taxation falls on the population at the rate, including the land revenues, of three rupees per head. In Madras it is two rupees and four annas. Taking the items I find that in the eleven years ending 1892-93, the growth of taxation has been in Mysore from 101 lakhs to 153 lakhs or 52 per cent; in Madras it has been from 735 to 884 lakhs, or 21 per cent."

The Secretary of State for India misapprehends the argument to which he alludes. When it is said the administration of India is "costly and intolerable," it is to be taken along with the fact of its extreme poverty. Mysore is more prosperous and can perhaps afford a more costly administration. And Mysore is not the only Native State that is more prosperous than British India. Sir Charles Dilke in the Indian Budget Debate of 1893 after drawing attention to what he called the "extraordinary progress" of Mysore goes on to say:—

"There has been similar progress in States of the Punjab. There is a very interesting book on the subject written by a gentleman who is Chief Secretary to the Government of the

Punjab.—Mr. Tupper, whose career, I may in passing say, is a striking disproof of the statement made by the Hon. Baronet (Sir W. Wedderburn) that a man could not rise in India unless he wrote smoothly of the powers that be. Mr. Tupper has declared that the Native States are progressing more rapidly than the more directly governed parts of the country. These facts are supported at great length, and coming as they do from great officials in the Government of India, are facts which we ought to reflect upon."

That there is less indebtedness of the people in the Native States is evident from a remark made by Mr. Baines, the last Census Commissioner, which is very significant. He says, "It is a very curious feature in the Census returns that the proportion of money-lenders who combine that occupation with the possession of land is far greater in British territory, than in the Native State."

The Growth of Civil and Military Expenditure.—"To interest English readers in questions of Indian finance is" wrote Macaulay to Napier in 1842 "quite impossible." This is just as true to-day as it was fifty years ago. The opening remarks of the Budget Statement are enough to clear the House of its Members, and to leave the Statement to be made before empty benches. But however uninteresting, or difficult to understand Indian finance may be, this at least is a simple fact, and so simple as to admit of no dispute, that the expenditure of the Government of India is constantly on the increase, and this increase has been greater within the last decade. The following valuable and clear statement* was prepared by Mr. Martin Wood, Member of the British Committee of the Congress, and was placed before Lord Welby's commission at an early period of its inquiries, and is to be found in p. 344 of "India" for 1896. It shows the progressive increase in the expenditure, the public debt, the council bills, home charges, and the excess of India's exports over imports for a period extending from 1864-5 to 1894-5.

How is this increase in the expenditure to be accounted for? Official apologists have tried to explain it away by ascribing it to loss of exchange, quietly ignoring that it is due mainly to increased military charges. Exchange has had its share, in disturbing the equilibrium of the finances, but that it alone is not responsible for this deplorable effect is evident from the fact that though within the last three years there has been an improvement on the head of exchange, and there has been a natural increase in the revenue besides what was obtained by additional taxation, yet the accounts do not show a disposition to balance themselves, even after making due allowance for the expenditure incurred in famine relief. Sir Auckland Colvin an ex-Finance Minister of India puts it down to increased Military expenditure, and writing in 1894 he stated that "since 1885 onwards so far as he was aware, Indian financiers have never budged from the position on this

* See next Page.

COMPARISON OF THREE STAGES OF INCREASE IN INDIAN EXPENDITURE DURING THE LAST THIRTY YEARS,

that is, from June, 1864-5, *to* 1894-5.

HEADS OF EXPENDITURE, ETC.	1864-5.		1874-5.		1884-5.		1894-5.		Increase.
	Rx.	Rx.	Rx.	Rx.	Rx.	Rx.	Rx.	Rx.	Rx.
(*a*) GROSS EXPENDITURE	...	45,840,000	...	57,690,000	...	71,366,070	...	94,163,600	48,323,600
Deduct chief items of outlay not being Administrative Charges:—									
Opium—Cultivation and Collection...	2,325,780	...	2,560,300	...	2,966,640	...	1,646,400	...	...
Salt—Production and Collection ...	462,130	...	492,680	...	449,328	...	497,600	...	...
Railways—Working Expenses... ...	1,565,430	...	4,085,000	...	12,949,306	...	23,629,400	...	...
		4,353,340		7,137,980		16,365,274		25,773,400	
(*b*) STATE EXPENDITURE Civil and Military	...	41,486,660	...	50,552,020	...	55,000,796	...	68,390,200	26,903,540
(*c*) ARMY CHARGES (adding Military Works charged to Revenue and deducting Receipts)	...	15,888,060	...	15,584,600	...	17,456,424	...	24,334,800	8,446,740
(*d*) CIVIL EXPENDITURE (including Post, Telegraph and Mint)	...	25,598,600	...	34,967,420	...	37,544,372	...	44,057,400	18,458,800
(*e*) AGGREGATE (Net) MILITARY EXPENDITURE (in three decades)	... ... Rx. 162, 464, 818				184,929,075		220,563,743		58,098,925
	To the decade ending 1884-5 must be added the contribution from the British Treasury, five millions sterling, approximately				5,850,000		(Includes Special Defence Works.)		
					190,779,075				
(*f*) PUBLIC DEBT at the period	...	Rx 74,457,681	...	69,757,678	...	93,132,425	...	104,349,278	Rx. 29,891,597
		£26,125,100	...	48,876,116	...	69,271,088	...	116,109,490	£89,984,390
(*g*) COUNCIL BILLS drawn for in the year...	...	£6,729,473	...	10,841,615	...	13,758,900	...	15,532,300	8,802,827
(*h*) HOME CHARGES during the year	...	£4,997,495	...	12,905,585	...	17,527,406	...	15,594,500	10,597,005
(*i*) EXCESS of India's EXPORTS over IMPORTS	...	Rx.19,960,000	...	13,620,000	...	15,630,000	...	34,082,000	
(*k*) ARREARS due from GUARANTEED RAILWAY COMPANIES for interest in excess of net earnings.	...	£6,650,000	...	24,629,000	...	25,949,613	...	13,185,015	

question of the increased military armaments. They have always uncompromisingly declared them to be hurried on at a cost beyond the resources of India. What has been done, has been done in spite of them, and in the teeth of their remonstrances." And in a controversy carried on in the Times with the India Office officials, Sir Auckland claimed to have established the following points, (1) that apart from war and other exceptional charges there has been between 1887—8 and 1893—4 a great increase in normal military expenditure in India, and (2) that this increase is greater than the increase due to exchange.

This is not the place to discuss the Frontier policy of the Government, but it will be instructive to asertain what share it has had in embarrassing the finances of the country. During the last 20 years India has spent Rx. 75,000,000 on and beyond the North-West Frontiers. The details will be found in a book published by Col. H. B. Hanna, styled "Indian Problems," No. 3. Archibald Constable and Co., The items which make up this amount are, Afghan War 1878-80, Rx. 22, 300,000, Military Railways, Rx. 16,400,000; Quetta, 1885, Rx. 2,300,000; Special Defence Works, Rx, 3,000,000; Increase in army 1886, 16,300,000; Chitral Campaign, Rx 2,150,000, Subsidies to Ameer and bribes, Rx 2,300,000; other Expenditure Rx 6,700,000; Operations 1897, (say) Rx 3,500,000; Total Expenditure, Rx 75,000,000. It is obvious then that the Frontier policy of the Government has swallowed up a large portion of the Indian Revenue, and compelled it besides to resort to loans, both in England and in India.

The Harshness of Revenue Settlements.—We have hitherto dealt with causes which were more or less beyond the control of the government, being themselves the result of a combination of untoward circumstances, or of mistaken policy. But we have now to consider a cause to which can be attributed to a large extent the miserable condition of the agriculturists, and which was undoubtedly preventible by the exercise of a moderate amount of administrative ability and fairness of mind on the part of the officials. But in truth these were but instruments of a Government which, judged by its actions, is open to the imputation of having been sordid and oppressive. However well-intentioned the English Parliament and the English people may be towards India, they have been unable to prevent the adoption of a policy towards the agriculturists, which, it required no great foresight to perceive, would end in their ruin. The early history of the English in India shows that the officials then were themselves corrupt and oppressive. That is happily a thing of the past, but the action of their successors in the callous indifference they have shown in the assessment of the land revenue, though under orders,

is equally open to objection and condemnation. Pages may be written on this subject but a few authorities cited below will be sufficient to prove the point :—

Bombay :—

"The overestimate of the capabilities of the Deccan acted upon by our early Collector drained the country of its agricultural capital, and accounts for the poverty and distress in which the cultivating population has ever since been plunged———All betokens a state of poverty. The more unfavourable results must mainly be attributed to a greater degree of overtaxation".—Blue Book on the Deccan Riots Commission p. 10.

Sir Auckland Colvin felt justified in "placing the excessive enhancements as the special cause which has disturbed the relations of the debtor and creditor in the Poona and adjoining districts."

Sir Theodore Hope in introducing the Deccan Relief Bill (1879) stated "To our revenue system must in candour be ascribed some share in the indebtedness of the ryot."

Madras :—

Mr. Fullerton a member of the Madras Government gives a graphic account of the practical working of the Ryotwari system soon after it was introduced in Madras :—

"Imagine the whole landed interest—that is all the landlords of Great Britain, and even the capital farmers at once swept away from off the face of the earth ; imagine a rent fixed on every field in the kingdom, seldom *under*, generally *above*, its means of payment; imagine the land so rented plotted out to the villagers according to the number of their cattle and ploughs, to the extent of forty or fifty acres each. Imagine the revenue rated as above leviable through the agency of one hundred thousand revenue officers, collected or remitted at their discretion according to their idea of the occupant's means of paying, whether from the produce of his land or his separate property ; and in order to encourage every man to act as a spy on his neighbour, and report his means of paying, that he may eventually save himself from extra demand, imagine all the cultivators of a village, liable at all times to a separate demand in order to make up for the failure of one or more individuals of the parish. Imagine Collectors to every county acting under the orders of a Board, on the avowed principle of destroying all temptation by a general equalisation of assessment ; seizing and sending back runaways to each other ; and lastly imagine the Collector, the sole Magistrate, or justice of the peace of the county, through the medium and instrumentality of whom alone any criminal complaint of personal grievances suffered by the subjects can reach the superior courts. Imagine at the same time every subordinate officer employed in the collection of the land revenue to be a *police officer*, vested with the power to *fine*, *confine*, put in the *stocks*, and *flog* any inhabitant within his range, on any charge, without oath of the accuser, or sworn recorded evidence in the case."

Can it be wondered at that such a system should have brought into existence the most unexampled cruelty and oppression, and that the collection of the revenue should have been accompanied by the use of the most horrible tortures, so that even the British conscience was roused and a Torture Commission appointed in 1854 to inquire into the matter. As to the shocking

disclosures then made any one intereseted in the subject may satisfy himself by reading Kaye's "History of the Administration of the East India Company" p. 223. Wholesale torture is now a thing of the past, but as is shown on a preceding page as to the number of evictions that take place, a more legalised form of coercion is exercised—" if you cannot pay out you go." How far the present condition of the agriculturists is a mitigation of the past it would be difficult to answer.

North-Western Provinces and Oude :—

" The stringency of the earlier assessments is thus accounted for. "The Company was always anxious to recoup the money spent on its conquests; the natural course of events necessitated large military expenditure; the first officers who were posted to the Province were naturally ignorant of local conditions, and were compelled to rely on a grossly corrupt native staff. Sufficient consideration was not given to the fact that the country had been desolated by a century of misrule and internal disturbance. Thus in Allahabad we begin by exacting Rs 10,000 more than had been paid to the Oude Government,—to which we succeeded. The result was that immediately one fifth of the revenue-paying lands of the District was brought to the hammer. In Cawnpoor the Board of Commissioners wrote at the time: " The District, we have reason to apprehend, was over-assessed at the first triennial settlement, and it is still suffering, we fear from the consequences of that injurious proceeding. Much too great an anxiety was manifested in this and other instances to draw from the country suddenly the utmost revenue which it could be supposed to yield. Large reductions became necessary, in consequence at the second settlement; but even after these concessions were made the assessment in particular estates was far from moderate." The North Western Provinces of India, by W. Crooke B.C. S., 1897, p. 305.

The evil consequences of the enhanced settlement of 1861 are thus described in the Oude Revenue Report of 1872 :—

" It would be difficult to meet with a single village except the larger talukas in which the owners are free from debt, and the land free from incumbrance. I can affirm with confidence that the money, save a fraction or so borrowed during the year, was taken to pay revenue, *and to no other purpose*. The Zamindars have been and are unable to meet the enhanced assessment."

" The margin left for the cultivator's subsistence is less than the value of the labour he has expended on the land. This district has 'the benefit of water communication by both the Ganges and the Jumna ; it is intersected by the East Indian Railway, and is partly traversed by the Ganges canal ; yet the land is only worth, five years' purchase, and the state of the average cultivator is one of hopeless insolvency and misery." (Report of the Collector, Cawnpore, 1879,on the settlement of that District.)

Central Provinces :—The deplorable condition of this province has been described by no less an authority than the Chief Commissioner in a report from which a passage has been quoted above. From information supplied in March last by the Secretary of State for India to Mr. S. Smith, it appears that whereas in 1883–84, the Land Revenue was 62 lakhs, in 1896 it amounted to 76½ lakhs—an increase of nearly 25 per cent. But the full effect of the recent Settlement will not be perceptible till a few years later, and then the

increase will be found to be nearer 50 per cent. Need we wonder that the cultivators, beset as they are with a scarcity extending over several years, are impoverished, indebted, and on the brink of starvation.

The absence of a Permanent Settlement.—The condition of every province in India has been noticed above, except Bengal. Is it different, and if so why? Let official opinion decide the matter.

"The revenue of the permanently estates in Bengal has for years been realised with great punctuality. Losses sometimes occur through failure of crops, epidemics, the devastations of cyclones, and other calamities of seasons; but as a rule the large present excess of the annual rental over the Government demand, enables holders to meet that demand even in the most disastrous years."—(Sir George Campbell's Administration Report for 1872-73)

"Great as was the progress which I know had been made in the position of the cultivating classes, I was quite unprepared to find them occupying a position so different from that which I remembered them to occupy when I first came to the country. They were then poor and oppressed, with little incentive to increase the productive powers of the soil. I find them now as prosperous, as independent and as comfortable as the peasantry, I believe, of any countryin the world; well fed, well clothed, free to enjoy the full benefit of their own labours and to hold their own and obtain prompt redress for any wrong."—(Sir Ashby Eden's speech in Calcutta in 1877.)

"The Bengal of to-day offers a startling contrast to the Bengal of 1793; the wealth and prosperity of the country have marvellously increased—increased beyond precedent—under the permanent settlement.—(Burdwan Commissioner's Report, Gazette of India, 20th October 1883).

Such is the official view of a Province where the pressure of population is greater than in any other part of India, the density per square mile being in Bengal 471, in Madras, 252, in Bombay, 207, in the United Provinces, 466, and in the Central Provinces, 125. A small portion of the Madras Presidency is also permanently settled, and though in the other parts Government is constantly obliged to remit the revenue or in other words is unable to realise it, yet where it is permanently fixed no loss is incurred by the State.

"The land revenue collections in Madras for 1876-77 are returned at £ 3,296,575 showing a decrease of £ 1,248, 438 below those of the previous year. Large remissions of revenue were rendered necessary on account of the decrease of cultivation and failure of crops. No remissions however had to be granted out of the permanently settled "demand.' (Moral and Material condition of India for 1876, p 28").

The evidence recorded by the Royal Commission on expenditure disclosed some curious facts. According to the India office, in Bengal, the landlords increased the rent about 17 per cent., in the 20 years ending 1895, or at the rate of 6 per cent. every seven years. But the seven year's ending 1895 witnessed an increase of land revenue by 12 per cent. in the Punjab and of the rental by 15 and 48 per cent. in the Central and the North Western Provinces. Such being the case, it is obvious, there need be some difference

in the condition of the cultivators in Bengal as compared with those of other Provinces.

Conclusion.—I have tried in the preceding pages to ascertain the present economical condition of India, and to any unprejudiced mind it will be evident from the mass of evidence that has been cited that not only is India poorer now than it was before, but that the causes of its poverty are more or less preventible by the Government which now rules over it. By fostering local industries and developing the resources of the country, by a larger employment of indigenous talent, by a reduction of the civil and especially the military expenditure, and by the leniency of its assessments or giving it fixity where possible, much may be done by the Government to relieve the impoverished condition of the masses of the people. If greater prominence has been given to the darker side of the picture, it is simply because it is a self-evident fact that under a civilised and humane Government there must be much that is creditable, much that is generous, much that is elevating, but of this there it can be no doubt that the darker shades over shadow the lighter, and that is the bounden duty of the Government to remove those shadows, which not only darken its own glory, but envelop in their gloom and misery millions of the people of India.

LINES OF LEGISLATION IN INDIA.

***

P. S. Sivaswamy Aiyar, B.A. B.L.

(Fellow of the University of Madras and Editor, Madras Law Journal.)

Any one who has observed the course of legislation in this country will be struck with certain features and tendencies which have become fairly pronounced in recent years. If we examine the records of legislation during the last few years, we shall find that a considerable number of statutes relate to fiscal measures or machinery, a considerable number to matters of procedure, a goodly number to amendments of previous statutes, and others to miscellaneous matters. Enactments dealing with substantive law are comparatively few, and it is but seldom that the subjects of legislation prove to be of interest and importance to the public. From this remark must of course be excluded the legislation of the last session which aroused an exceptional interest among the people, an interest more properly described as sensational. In certain directions and in certain matters, one notices a timidity, or a reluctance on the part of the Government in moving the legislature. There is also much ground for dissatisfaction as to the form of the enactments introduced. Careful, accurate and elegant draftsmanship is at a heavy discount in our Legislative Councils. Amendments of existing statutes are made in a haphazard and slovenly way and but little regard is paid to the congruity of such amendments with other parts of the statutes amended. The remark may perhaps be severe, but numerous instances can be cited to justify it. An instance or two however must suffice. In regard to the execution of decrees, the Allahabad High Court applied indiscriminately the procedure applicable to suits and was working the Procedure Code in a manner productive of very great hardship to suitors. The legislature desired to obviate this hardship by an amendment of Section 647 of the Code of Civil Procedure which lays down that the procedure prescribed shall be followed in all proceedings other than suits and appeals. An explanation was introduced which declared. that the section did not apply to applications for execution of decrees. The result of this amendment is, that there are no rules of procedure to govern the action of the executing Courts in matters which are not expressly provided for in Chapter XIX. Another instance of clumsy amendment of the previous law may be found in section 30 of the Guardian and Ward's Act of 1890. Under the Bengal Minor's Act, it had been held that a mortgage of a minor's property without the sanction

of the Court was void *ab initio.* It was probably felt that it was sufficient for the protection of the minor's interest to declare the transaction voidable. The transaction might in many cases be advantageous to the minor and it might be desirable for him to ratify it. Section 30 of the present Act, which was introduced to effect this object, declares that the transaction is voidable at the instance of any other person affected thereby. These words suggest that it is voidable at the instance of persons other than the minor and that it is not voidable at his instance. But this would be preposterous and the section has to be construed with reference to the intention of the legislature rather than with reference to the language.

If we point out any defects in the matter or the form of legislation, it is from no carping spirit and from no want of appreciation of the conditions and difficulties under which the Government has worked, or of the amount of good work already achieved by it under these conditions. The object of these few pages is merely to indicate the necessity for an improvement in the methods and subjects of legislation and to suggest some of the lines on which legislation must move in the future. Many of the conditions and difficulties, we have referred to, have perhaps been unavoidable. On several matters, the Government would probably desire to legislate, were it not held back by a dread of offending deep-rooted popular sentiments. In other matters, the Government considers itself bound to a policy of non-interference, partly from fear of offending the susceptibilities of people at home. In some matters again, the Government is unable to introduce a measure, which it is convinced will be good for one Province, because it may not be good for another Province, and its introduction in one Province alone may give rise to dissatisfaction in another. It cannot be said that considerations like these ought not to have had weight with the Government; but they have often been allowed to have too much weight. How far these considerations should be yielded to, or overcome is a matter upon which the Government can derive valuable assistance from the leaders and exponents of public opinion in the country. The slight enlargement of our Legislative Councils and any further enlargement and improvement in their constitution must tend to furnish the Government with better facilities for ascertaining the opinions of the people. It is matter for regret that there should be a tendency on the part of persons highly placed in the Government of the country to treat with distrust or contempt the opinions of the educated classes. After doing its best to educate the people according to English methods, and to imbue their minds with respect and admiration for English History, English Law, English Justice and English Government,

it seems not a little unfair, that the Government should turn round upon the classes whom it has called into existence and find fault with them for being no better than what they have been taught to be and tell them that by reason of their very education they have become estranged from the masses and are even less qualified to understand and represent the wants of the people than their rulers. If an educated Indian were employed in England for a long number of years in some office under the Government and in consequence of his long connection with the country claimed to be better able to represent the views of the English masses than the graduates of Oxford or Cambridge, his pretensions would probably be scouted with derision. But the sense of the humorous forsakes the Englishman, when he puts forward a claim to know the natives of this country better than their own educated countrymen. If the Government will abandon the policy of distrust and treat the views of the educated classes with greater consideration, it will supply itself with better means, than it now possesses, of gauging the sentiments of the people and placing its legislative machinery in touch with the people. In every country, the educated classes are the guides of the people and it would be a grievous mistake to imagine that the opinions held by such classes in India do not represent the views of the people, unless they are endorsed by turbulent mass-meetings.

In illustration of our remarks, reference may be made to some measures which have been long advocated, but which have not received much active support or encouragement from the Government. The management of Hindu Religious Endowments has been in a most unsatisfactory condition and the necessity for a change in the law relating to them has been widely felt and repeatedly urged. The remedies available under the existing law have been found utterly insufficient to check abuses, and except by recourse to stringent legislation, there is no prospect of protection to the revenues or endowments of religious institutions. In Southern India, at any rate, it may be safely said that there has been a consensus of opinion as to the urgency of a reform in this matter. Numerous as have been the proposals and representations made to the Government, they have all been shelved and the day seems to be as distant as ever, when management of these institutions will be placed on a sound basis. It is not unnatural that under these circumstances it should be believed by the people that the reluctance of the Government is due to its belonging to an alien religion and to its want of sympathy with the religions of the land. While the Government may not perhaps feel justified in helping the religions of the country with pecuniary aid, it is at any rate bound to see that the properties which have been dedicated by others to religious trusts are not wasted or misappropriated.

any more than properties devoted to private trusts. There is no cause dearer to the Hindu community than the cause of religion, and public trusts of a religious character should be at least as sacred in the eyes of those who make or administer the law, as private trusts. Any legislation which will secure efficiency in the management of religious institutions will be sincerely welcomed by the people and the Government need be hampered by no fear of running counter to their sentiments.

Another direction in which legislation may be usefully introduced, though it must be done very cautiously, is in regard to the personal laws of the natives. While we think that the time is not yet come for any general codification of the Hindu Law, it would be a very useful step towards that end, to enact as statutes, those portions of the law in regard to which there is not much chance of further development by judicial decisions or in regard to which the community is likely to welcome a change. We may for instance, cite the two Bills drafted by the Honorable Mr. Bhashyam Aiyangar for introduction into the Madras Legislative Council, viz, the Hindu Gains of Learning Bill and the Hindu Sister's Bill. The former Bill starts on the basis of the law as now administered by the Courts and is designed to put an end to the demoralising effects of claims by other members of the family to a share in the acquisitions of a man made with the help of learning on the ground that the learning had been acquired at the expense of the joint family. Claims of this sort are disallowed by the Bill and the acquisitions made by learning are declared to belong solely to the acquirer, irrespective of any question as to the means by which the learning was acquired. The latter Bill is intended to assign a higher place in the scheme of intestate succession to a deceased man's sister who is under the present law postponed to all his agnate and cognate male relations. This again is a matter in which the Hindu community would approve of a change in the law as at present administered. It requires the greatest care to ascertain what parts of the Hindu law are ripe for codification and what are not. There are many portions of the Hindu Law which are still in a fluid condition and in regard to which premature codification would be mischievous. But the question is one which can be determined without much difficulty by consulting Hindu Lawyers of ability and experience.

Another direction in which legislation is needed is the complete revision of the more important enactments passed by the legislature, in regard to which numerous defects have been brought to light during the years they have been worked. Among other enactments of the kind may be mentioned the Code of Civil Procedure, the Limitation Act and the Transfer of Property Act. The mode hitherto adopted of dealing with some of these defects

has been to introduce amendments piece-meal, wherever there has been a diversity of opinion between the various High Courts. The amendments have in most cases been ill-designed and clumsily drafted and do not neatly fit in with other portions of the acts amended. The drafting of statutes is a work which requires special knowledge and skill and one is sorry to find very little evidence of the possession of the requisite knowledge and skill by the Supreme Legislative Council. Even in regard to the ascertainment of the matters in respect of which amendments are needed in the various acts, the *modus operandi* adopted by the Government is not well fitted to secure the object. The procedure apparently seems to be to pick out the points upon which the different High Courts have held different opinions and to consult the Judges of the High Courts as to the desirability of amending the Law so as to produce uniformity. The Judges of our High Courts are among the hardest-worked of the officials of the country and cannot spare the time required to enable them to give satisfactory opinions upon extra-judicial questions submitted to them. Still less can they find the time to initiate suggestions for amendment upon points not referred to them. It must also be remembered that practising lawyers are in a far better position to realise the defects and hardships of the existing law than even the judges. We cannot give a better illustration of the existing method and its results than by referring to the revision of the Criminal Procedure Code in the beginning of this year. Advantage was taken of the occasion by various members of the public to point out various provisions in the old law which caused hardship. But few of these suggestions were adopted by the Government and so far as the interests of the liberty of the individual are concerned, the new act is no improvement upon its predecessor. The Government had its own expert in the person of Sir Henry Prinsep, and what more did it want? The substantial result of the revision may be roughly said to be the increase of the police power of the Government. The only satisfactory method of dealing with a revision of our Codes is by the appointment of a law commission composed of three or four English Lawyers of eminence and of three or four distinguished native Indian Lawyers one for each of the Presidencies. It is also necessary that the Government should as a rule consult the Bar Associations in the Presidency Towns, including in the term Bar, the whole body of Legal Practitioners, in regard to Bills introduced or intended to be introduced into the Legislative Council. It may, no doubt, be said that it is open to the various Bar Associations, or, for the matter of that, to any individuals, to volunteer their opinions to the Council and that their representations will, in accordance with the stereo-typed language of the Government, receive due consideration. But there is a great difference

a Supreme Court of Justice was established in Calcutta. It was provided by section 34, that "All offences and misdemeanours, which shall be laid, tried and inquired of, in the said Supreme Court shall be tried by the Jury of British subjects resident in the town of Calcutta and not otherwise." A similar Court was established in Madras in the year 1800 and 24 years later a Court of Oyer and Terminer and Gaol Delivery was established in Bombay by Letters Patent of King George IV.

In this manner trial by jury was introduced into the three Presidency towns of India under Royal Charters and our Sovereign Queen alone can abrogate the right of jury trials from these places and Allahabad, where so recently as in 1866 a High Court was first established.

In 1852 a Bill was introduced in the Council of India to give to every man the right of being lawfully tried by the judgment of his peers, but it did not become law.

A little after the mutiny a Code of Criminal Procedure was drafted in England by the Indian Law Commissioners, and having received the approval of such eminent jurists as Sir Barnes Peacock, Sir Mordaunt Wells, Sir C Jackson and others as suitable to the requirements of this country, it was introduced in the Council of India in 1859. The Bill passed as Act XXV of 1861. By this act it was enjoined on the provincial Governments to take immediate measures for the proper introduction of trial by jury in their respective provinces. Agreeably, the system was introduced into seven districts of the Bengal and some nine districts of the Madras Presidency. In the Bombay Presidency the system has been gradually introduced into six districts only up to this day.

But before I dilate on this point, the system of trial by the "Panchayat" needs particular reference, for, strangely enough, every part of India retains this system. Even in Ceylon there is the *gam sabha*, as the only relic of her ancient civilization. Whether it is a hamlet or a village, each has its distinct mode of settling litigation with the aid of the panchayatees. In its essence, it is trial by jury in miniature without the disadvantage of being at all a costly and lengthy procedure.

In the law-book of *Yajnavalkya*[1] we find that the *Pradvivak* (Chief Justice) presided over the Court of the King in Council and administered justice with the aid of an uneven number of *Sâbhashads* (members of the assembly), who were selected from all classes of the people. The *Panchayat*

1 This book is supposed to be an abbreviation of the code of Manu and was composed about 500 A.D. It again has a commentary in the Mitakshara, written some five hundred years later by Vijnaneswara Bhatta. This latter book is the chief authority at the present day, with the Hindus on civil contracts; the law of inheritance &c.

is derived from the above mode of trial in ancient India. It may be called the Indian Jury of five,[2] and is nominated by both the disputing parties, each party nominating two, and the four so nominated appointing a fifth as their spokesman. The five have to hear the dispute and the evidence, and to find out the truth. Sir George Campbell in his "Modern India" speaks of the Panchayat "as one of the most marked in the customs of the country and having the strongest of all the sanctions, that of public opinion." In the rationalistic period of the ancient history of India, we find the system prevalent in the Judical procedure of the Buddhist Monastic Order. It was not seldom that the members of this Order were divided by sundry disputes, and in the Pitakas, the Bible of the Buddhists, several rules are laid down for the regulation of these disputes, it being enjoined that the disputed points shall be referred to a jury, and judgment pronounced in agreement with the vote of the majority :—

(I allow you, Oh Bhikkhus! to settle such a dispute by the vote of the majority. A Bhikkhu who shall be possessed of five qualifications shall be appointed as taker of the voting tickets—one who does not walk in partiality, one who does not walk in malice, one who does not walk in fear, ... If, Oh Bhikkhu! while the case is being inquired into by those Bhikkhus pointless speeches are brought forth and the sense of any single utterance is not clear, I enjoin upon you, Oh Bhikkhu! to settle the case by referring it to a jury. And a Bhikkhu to be chosen on a jury must be possessed of ten qualities: he must be virtuous, upright, living according to rules, versed in the traditions &c. &c.)[3]

I have quoted this at length as showing that trial by jury, when it came to be introduced into this country, was not a mere exotic plant, but had already been naturalized to the soil by the usage of some thousands of years, long before the dawn of civilization in the west.

But coming nearer to our own times we find the system peculiarly ingrained in the very life of the natives of India. The village community system, the Panch, the Mahajan and even the Caste system are all but enlarged forms of trial by jury.

It was this system of the Panchayat then that, in 1799 Mr Jonathan Duncan of Bombay by special regulation formally acknowledged in civil trials, being assured of its success from the examples of Bengal and Madras, at which places it had been introduced in civil trials some 6 years back.

2 This number is peculiarly sanctimonious with the Hindus.

Panch Parmeshwar is a common saying amongst them, and by it is implied that if five persons are unanimous, their voice is as unerring as the voice of God.

3 The 4th Khandhaka of the Chullacagga, as quoted in Mr. R. C. Dutt's "Civilization in ancient India."

In Bombay, the Panchayat or Assessor system was first introduced in criminal trials in 1827; five years later it found similar admission in the Bengal Law Courts; and it was in 1843 that certain districts of Madras obtained the same mode of criminal trials. But in such introduction the primitive native institution was greatly modified in many points. Particularly the panchayatees were deprived of the right of deciding and pronouncing their judgment over the point at issue. They were constituted as assessors or members of the Court in order that the Sessions Judges may avail themselves of the benefit of their observations, in the examination of witnesses, or "by employing them, more nearly as a jury to attend during the trial to suggest points of inquiry, and after consideration to deliver their verdict." which might or might not be accepted by the judges.

I have mentioned above that it was after the year 1862 that jury trials were introduced into the several districts of the three Presidencies as necessitated by Act XXV of 1861 of the Council of India. But in the Madras Presidency in 1827, Sir Thomas Munro, the then Governor of that place, was preparing a Jury Act for criminal trials. Unfortunately, he was carried away by cholera in the same year, and Mr. Henry Sullivan Greame, who was his successor in office for a brief period, passed the Jury Act and made it the law of the land.

Wherein it was premised that the Government deemed it expedient to introduce the system in order to expedite criminal trials, and to raise the character of the people, and to facilitate the tracing of facts from the evidence by the extended employment of the natives of India in the administration of criminal justice. Until the introduction of the Criminal Procedure Code in 1862, the jury system worked satisfactorily in most of the districts where it was introduced by the said Act. At the present day, all the Madras Sessions Courts—those in the Agency Tracts of Ganjam, Godavery, and Vizagapatam being excepted—obtain trial by Jury in certain criminal cases and the assistance of two or three assessors in other cases. But while Madras has been so fortunate in her criminal administration, her sister presidencies, Bombay and Bengal have another story to tell.

The Bombay Government has been able to introduce the system into Poona, Surat, Karachi, Belgaum, Ahmedabad and Thanna only, leaving alone eighteen other district courts to administer justice as best they can, some by the aid of assessors, and some by the training of their law-officers. Again, it was after great difficulty and delay that the people of the said six districts appeared to their Government educated enough to serve as jurors. Even then, there were not wanting some high officials who declared that the system worked most unsatisfactorily and failed to promote the ends

of justice. On the other hand, the learned judges of the High Court, who were from time to time asked to report on the working of the system, have declared in its favour. Sir Charles Sargent, as Chief-Justice, had expressed his opinion that the present working of the system had in "no way affected the judicial administration of the country", that "the misgivings were not to such an extent as to create public dissatisfaction", and "any change in its working is much to be deprecated."

The people of Satara prayed for the extension of the system to their law courts in 1885, but their prayer was not granted, and it seems there is no likelihood of its being granted at any early date. It is not that there is no room for the extension of this system—a system of the highest value to a nation with the possession of which for the trial of criminal cases no country can be enslaved, and without which no country can be free—to the other districts of the Presidency, but the latter-day mood of some high officials is for retrogression and repression of that which the people rightly claim to possess. Education and particularly higher education—which only mere prattlers or men of an unsound state of mind can condemn as the dreadful explosives of Mill, Milton, and Macaulay—is spreading into every part of the British Indian Empire, and the very key-note of British rule in India is to educate the masses to imbibe Western thought, modes and manners of rightful citizenship and loyal subjects. To declare that the Indians have not advanced a jot under their present rulers, is to libel the rule of India and insult her rulers. Many a district can be found where the extension of the jury system would be a support and a gain to the criminal administration. Justice Beverly of Bengal has observed: "The employment of juries to try criminal cases *does tend to disseminate a knowledge of the criminal Law* and such extended knowledge, it may be presumed, must have a tendency to repress crime."

Coming to the Presidency of Bengal, the Jury system has attracted much public attention there. The system was, in 1862, introduced into the districts of Dacca, Hoogly, Burdwan, Nuddea, Morshedabad, Patna, and 24 Pergunnahas, and it has been confined to these places alone. For nearly a quarter of a century, and half that period again, the system has administered justice in these districts and it ought to be a question for serious consideration why it is that the system has not been extended to other places. So far back as in 1874, Cuttack, Midnapore, Chittagong and three other districts were recommended by some officials as worthy of the system, but for reasons unknown to the general public, these districts have to contend themselves with ordinary trials. Five years after the first introduction of jury trials in the seven districts named above, preliminary

inquiry was made into the working of the system and the report was favourable. Thereupon the good Sir Cecil Beadon, on the eve of his departure from Bengal, spoke very highly of the Bengal juries and recommended the extension of the system to the non-jury districts. If His Excellency's term of office had not then neared expiry, most of the remaining 39 districts of the Presidency would have obtained trial by jury. In 1884, Lord Ripon instituted inquiries as to the places which could obtain the system, but the High Court Judges, with the exception of Justices Mitter, Norris and Ghose, expressed a firm opinion that the Lower Provinces were not ripe for such an extension. Two years before this, the Indian Criminal Procedure Code had been revised for the second time and passed as a Special Act of 1882. In this new code, an innovation was made under Sec. 269, whereby the Provincial Governments were empowered to withdraw certain offences from the cognizance of Juries. The Government of Sir Charles Elliot of Bengal, seemed to be averse to keeping it a dead-letter section, and on the 26th October 1892, the public of Calcutta were roused from their slumbers to read in the press the ill-advised and unjust intention of the Government to withdraw certain offences that had been tried by juries for some 30 years. The public was greatly indignant at such a retrograde measure and appealed for redress. The unfettered voice of the British Press listened to the appeal and pronounced that "an outrageous blow upon human liberty has been aimed by a tyrannical bureaucrat in Bengal". The Parliament of Great Britain, true to its prestige, ordered an impartial inquiry, and a Jury Commission was formed for that purpose. As the outcome of the inquiry, within 154 days from its issue, the Government of Bengal had to cancel that notorious notification of withdrawal. Since then, the jury system has had its rest, despite the professional mumblings of a pampered section of the Anglo-Indian Press.

In the Punjab, the system is liberally introduced, but it is not so in the N. W. P. and Oudh, where only Allahabad, Benares and Lucknow are aware of it. In the Central Provinces, the districts of Nagpore, Jubbulpore, Saugor, Raipore, and Hoshangabad enjoy the benefits of this great safeguard of liberty. The entire province of Assam is blessed with jury trials.

If the opinions pronounced by eminent lawyers, men of weight and learning, high officials, and even rulers from time to time, on the merits or otherwise of the system were to be carefully weighed, the *pros* would outnumber the *cons* both in figures and in the intrinsic value of the statements. If the destinies of the Indian were wielded by a Minto, a Munro, or a Mayo, a Cornwallis or a Canning, a Ripon or a Reay, there can never

have existed the possibility of even the faintest cry of disloyalty or political agitation. Racial distinction and unsympathetic defiant attitude of the ruling officers will ever be provided with antidotes, by virtue of progress and education, and the stronger will survive. Trial by jury is not free from distinction or defiance, and I will refer to it later.

In some of the non-injury districts, another mode of trial is acknowledged in the law courts, viz.—Trial by Assessors. The root of this kind of trial is in the system of the Panchayat, and it may be termed the constitutional sister of trial by jury. The main principle involved in it is to give to an accused, where the nature of the alleged offence and its consequences are supposed to be serious, the right of a *free trial, i.e.*, a trial by a special periodical court consisting of persons chosen by lot from the educated and leading members of the communities of the place where the trial is held, and presided over by a Session's Judge. This court is held regularly every month and most seriously and pompously, persons accused under the kind of offences triable by assessors, are made to stand their trial. The assessors are chosen with the same care and from the same type of persons as in the case of jury trials. The procedure again is in no wise different from that of her sister institution. But when the assessors pronounce their verdict, if the presiding judge is inclined to differ from them, well may he do so, by hinting to the assessors, "gentlemen, thanks for the trouble and worry you have undergone, you are wrong in your opinion and I will look to the case myself, as the law provides for me to discount your verdict and insult your sense of judging." He then passes his own sentence and there is an end to the case. This is a most ludicrous way of rendering justice. It is a sham in the name of free trial and the sooner it is amended the better.

In the case of a mofussil jury, if the sessions judge differs from the opinion of the jury, he can, under the existing law, refer the case to the High Court, and the appeal judge can decide over the verdict of the jury. Why should not the same law be made applicable in the case of assessors' trials. Considering the *calibre* and experience of our Sessions Judges it is highly essential that their powers should have a controlling agency and not a free defiant scope of action. The Government of India cannot but be conscious of the eccentricities and short comings of these proud officials when it is said unchallenged :—"The Bombay Government in criticising trial by jury observe that the Sessions Judges have little experience of juries and are not practised in delivering charges".* Also "Juries are

---

* "The Jury question", a paper read before the East India Association in England in 1893 by Sir John Jardine, lately a Judge of the Bombay High Court.

more often right on the facts than judges in their self-sufficiency give them credit for" * and again, a complimentary tribute has been paid by Judge Woogan of Cuttack, Bengal, to our assessors. He observed in 1884:— "I have found the assessors as a rule take an intelligent interest in the proceedings, in which I have always endeavoured to make them feel that they occupy an important and practical position, and though I think them in some cases prone to acquit, I have frequently found where I have overruled, that their doubts were endorsed by the High Court on appeal." And it is an established fact that in the majority of the cases in jury trials, in which the Sessions Judges differed from the verdicts of the juries, the High Court on reference as provided by sec. 307 of Cr. P. C. (this section was inserted in 1872, when the code was revised for the first time), approved of such verdicts. †

Trial by Assessors can only be upheld if the assessors have any significance but if their opinion is to be discarded after they are made legally bound to give their opinion, the system had better perish. For, as it is, the people are wrongly deluded with the enjoyment of a privilege which in reality is denied to them. In state trials, the system at once becomes farcical and unmaintainable. Even in the matter of trial by jury, sec. 307 is not very commendable, as it tends to weaken the very constitution of this great institution. With all nations it is a grave and difficult task to administer proper criminal justice to the accused and "better ten guilty escape than one innocent perish" fully bears out this difficulty. India is a country where the standard of existence is so low, and the dread of the Deity so glaringly insignificant, that, for the sake of a paltry one-figured sum, life is cruelly done away with and crime shamefully fostered.‡ The Indian Law reports bear ample testimony to this statement, as also to the shocking malpractice of the Indian Police in detecting crime. It is only too often that the Sessions Judges have brought to the knowledge of the Government that the Mofussil Police is corrupt, oppressive and crimeful.

Sir A Rivers Thompson, as the former ruler of the Bengal Presidency, thought it a wise thing that the jury men should scrupulously weigh the evidence of the Police before accepting it, as his experience of a Sessions Judge convinced him that the Police were not what should be desired, and

* Mr. Benson, Sessions Judge of Arcot, Madras, (now a Judge of the High Court) at the time of the general inquiry in 1890 on the working of the system,

† Vide, The 8th Congress Report appendices II, III & IV.

‡ From this, it must not be presumed that India is a country of crimes; the following prison statistics might be interesting:—90 persons are in prison per every hundred thousand in England, 158 in France, 230 in Italy, 120 in the United States of America, 160 in Japan and 38 in India.

that they were matchless experts at concoction. A case can be found from the year's working of each of the Supreme Courts, where the Police are accused of manufacturing crime and getting up evidence for proving such crimes. *

Besides, the Sessions Judges are quaintly appointed, and are men of little practical experience at the bar; like birds of passage, at one time they are deemed to mingle with the Burmans, and at another Maharattas, or again the Sikhs can safely be put under their protection. Let alone their legal training, have they any worldly wisdom gathered by experience? Cadets of an illustrious and renowned service in the middle of their twenties, they come out to the land of India, destined to rule ever innumerable mute creatures. Neither custom, caste nor creed are they conscious of, but they have a full knowledge of their proud position and of the no less exalted learning that raised them to that dignity. These then are the Indian Sessions Judges that are empowered by law to differ from the verdicts of the juries.

Now treasons, felonies, murders, forgeries, perjuries, crimes, extortions, misdemeanours, offences, wrongs and oppressions are classified for jury trials in the Presidency towns, but in the districts, the jury liability is limited and the Presidency governments have power to specify from time to time the particular kind of offences requiring the judgment of a jury. (On this point, it may be observed that provision should be made in the Penal Code, that may give to the natives the same privilege that is enjoyed by the Europeans under the Summary Jurisdiction Act, viz, the right to demand trail by jury in serious offences.) All of these offences are of such a nature, that a little personal knowledge of the accused and the accuser and of the surrounding circumstances of the crime can lead to a right understanding and decision, and that, a jury of the place alone can do it.

But it has been said that the ignorance and want of culture of the ordinary Indian, his timidity and religious and social prejudices are in the way of his delivering a rational verdict in a case.

Why, the much-abused political advancement and the present day generation of higher education, (that have made India materially poor, as is said by that prolific generator, himself the product of his own germ) afford light enough to dispel the darkness of this accusation.

That in murder cases the Indian Jury take an unreasonably mild view of the conduct of the accused is another argument of aversion to the system.

---

* A case from the district of Thanna was referred to the Bombay High Court some years ago in which the bones of a crocodile were found to have been produced for these of a man said to have been murdered.

Capital punishment is a much contested point and it will ever remain so in a humanitarian world. And the Government of India have enacted that a Sessions Judge is not bound to pass a sentence of death even in murder cases, but he may sentence to transportation for life giving his reasons for so doing. But if he chooses to pass a sentence of death, then it can only be put into execution after two appeal Judges of the High Court have considered the case over again and confirmed the sentence. It is with such reserve and caution that the extreme penalty of the law is to be enforced, and it is just possible that the inborn religious scruples about hanging may oftener lead the Indian juries to a weak verdict coupled with a recommendation to mercy.

Officials have often clamoured against the failure of justice in jury trial, but they have never made it clear where the failure comes from. When questioned as to the points of amendment in the present mode of the system they have none to suggest. The cry is: "Do away with the system" and that is in keeping with their Indianized English views of freedom, so much in prominence of late which, let us hope, may one day show to them their folly and shortsightedness, and convert then once again to the broad-mindedness for which the British are justly celebrated.

In 1890 a general inquiry was instituted into the working of the system in India, and the opinion of the majority of the High Court Judges was in its favour. The opinions suggested many useful points for deliberation and established without doubt that the judicial soil of India is congenial to the institution of trial by Jury. Let me quote what the late lamented Chief Justice Sir Charles Farran of Bombay had to say in the matter. "When a Judge and jury work harmoniously together, and the evidence is sifted by the Judge in his charge, and the true issues which arise are pointed out to the jury the verdict of the latter . . . *by reason of the local knowledge they possess and their more perfect acquaintance with the habits, customs and modes of thought, of the accused and of the witnesses examined before them is more likely to be correct than the decision of a Judge though the latter approaches the considerations of the case with a more trained intelligence and a more logicial mind, but with less accurate perception of native life and native thought.* Such an opinion is worthy ot the man whose untimely loss in a foreign land the people mourn with a sorrowing heart.

Under various sections of the Criminal Procedure Code, the rights of European British subjects are defined and maintained. It must be farthest from the intentions of any and every Indian to dispute such rights or belittle their importance. European misdemeanants are placed at a certain disadvantage when they have to stand their trial under a law modified and

codified to make it properly applicable to the wants of this country.

It is therefore essential that there should be laid out certain sections for the special conduct of the law in trials where the accused belongs to the nationality of the ruling race. Sec. 451, Cr. P. C. comes under such description, and it establishes that a European British subject can justly claim to be tried by his co-religionist, or by a mixed jury instead of by a jury of natives, and that in places where such a jury is not practicable the case may be transferred to some other court where it is practicable.

Trial by jury is an English Institution and in a country like India of mixed nationalities and many languages, it is essential that a British subject, when accused of a crime, should have a fair, representative and proper jury trial. No privilege that secures a free trial, *i.e.*, trial by equals, can be condemned and the aims of this section are commendable. In the same manner, Sec. 275 provides that in a Court of Session if an accused person who is not a European or an American, wishes to be tried by a jury the majority of which shall consist of persons who are neither Europeans nor Americans, then he shall be so tried. This is also a laudable safeguard against indiscreet judgment. But the regret is that, while the former section is universally applicable to all jury trials, the latter is not so applicable. Now the same reasons that justify the concession in the one case hold good with equal force in the other case. The language in which the trials are conducted being foreign, it is essential that an extension of Sec. 275 be made so as to be universally applicable to the other nationalities under trials by jury.

Such an extension is indispensable for political trials.

In the trial of such cases the noble prestige and the fair fame of the rulers are involved and every care must be taken that the jury is not packed up of partisans of the Government, but is always fairly representative. And it is absurd to say that in the trial of a person who is not a European, a jury, the majority of which consists of Europeans is a representative one. In times of political agitation and racial disturbance, such a jury is contrary to the proud traditions of British justice and an outrage on the accused person.

In the trial of European subjects accused of murder and other serious offences, many a European Jury, has, it must be said with regret, proved faithless to its sense of justice. This degrading scandal having assumed serious proportions, only recently the new Chief Justice of Bengal was obliged to refer to it and exhort a European jury to be true to their oaths and deal out justice without being led away by any notions of sympathy for the prisoners of their own nationality.

In political trials the Counsel for the Crown must waive his right of challenging jurors. For, the jurors are chosen by chance from a number of persons summoned by the Clerk of the Crown, and the accused have not the slightest possibility of choosing sympathetic jurors.

The greatest defect of the system is the way in which the jury lists are prepared. The present system is full of imperfections and defects, as the lists are prepared in a very haphazard way. No doubt there are various rules and regulations for the selection of jurors, but it has been found that these are not scrupulously followed. In England, a nominal fee of a guinea per trial is paid to the special jurors, and the question of paying juries in India must be considered of importance for securing able men as jurors. Besides, jurors are put to much hardship and inconvenience in the present irregular way they are summoned at every sessions from day to day. In fact, there is much that makes the task of a juror burdensome and there are many men of light, learning and qualification who endeavour to keep out of the jury lists.

In conclusion, I cannot help repeating what I have said in my little book on this subject, that trial by jury is a part and parcel of the fundamental principles of a free Government, and England, the land of the free, as she is proudly and boldly termed, cannot consistently do away with the system; she cannot erase it from her judical administration in any part of her vast dominions. It was, it is, and it must ever remain, the pride of her Judical Administration. It has flourished in all its pristine vigour and "has so long stood and still stands so high in public favour, because, notwithstanding all its glaring and familiar defects, no other machinery has ever been devised which is not open to similar or greater strictures."—*Salus populi suprema lex.*

THE ADMINISTRATION OF JUSTICE IN INDIA.

—✻✻✻—

V. KRISHNASWAMI IYER Esq., B. A. B. L.,

(*Vakil, High Court, Madras, & Editor, "Madras Law Journal".*)

Among the various blessings of British Rule in India none has a higher place than the impartial administration of justice. It may be, that the peace we enjoy and the security of person and property that is now almost the birth-right of every subject of Her Majesty fill a larger space in the public estimate of the beneficial results of British domination. These are undoubtedly great advantages and the *sine qua non* of all progress. But in its silent working and far reaching effects, the just administration of just laws though it appeals less to the eye and the imagination is fraught with incalculable good to the country at large. Other Governments there have been in this land, which in their time gave peace and security to the people. But it is the proud boast of England to have been the first to enact equal laws and to administer them impartially. England has taught this country that no man is above the law, that all men shall have equal treatment in the eye of the law, that even the Government is limited in the exercise of its powers and prerogatives and is liable for infraction of individual rights and that no man shall be punished except for infringment of known laws definitely established. These principles have been faithfully and conscientiously adhered to for more than a century of British Rule. The object of this paper is however not to paint the excellences in the constitution and the working of our Courts and to sing the praises of our laws, but to examine the defects which the experience of the past has laid bare and which are of a general and wide reaching character and to suggest what seem to us the appropriate remedies. As the first fruits of a just and beneficent administration, there has grown up a large and intelligent class of people trained in the history and institutions of the west and capable of appreciating and criticising the methods of Government. It is but natural to expect that conditions that were some time ago unquestioningly accepted as inevitable should be questioned and challenged to justify their continuance. The administration of justice has therefore been examined by men competent to judge of it in every aspect, and defects and draw-backs in the laws administered and in the constitution and working of the Courts that administer the law have been

carefully pointed out. These have, from time to time, been pressed upon the attention of the constituted authorities and have received a full, if not altogether, a sympathetic hearing. A benevolent despotism, as the Government of India has been often described to be, is generally impatient of criticism, more especially if it proceeds from quarters which cannot compel a respectful hearing; but some of these suggestions have been accepted as theoretically sound, or, "as counsels of perfection" impracticable in the present financial position of the country. The party of reform has at the risk of being traduced as "veiled seditionists" been obliged to perform the duty which a liberal and enlightened opposition in England would do, of educating public opinion to a perception of the evils of the present system and of persuading the Government to accept and carry out however partially the programme of the reformers. The defects and the remedies have many of them been publicly agitated so that we may feel tolerably certain that they represent the educated public opinion of the country. The subject of this paper naturally divides itself into two parts, namely, Civil and Criminal Justice.

Civil Justice.

Dealing with Civil Justice, the first point to which attention may be drawn is the constitution of the Courts. British India is divided into several Provinces each having a High Court with a charter from the Crown or a Chief Court or Judical Commissioner, all being Courts of appeal from the District Courts, Civil and Criminal. The decision of the highest Court of the province is final except in certain cases in which an appeal lies to the Privy Council. It exercises supervision over all subordinate Courts with powers of second appeal on questions of law and of revision over the Courts of Small Causes throughout the province. The Courts subordinate to the High Court in each Province are the Court of the District Judge, the Court of the additional Judge or joint or Assistant Judge, the Court of the subordinate Judge, and the Court of the Munsiff. In some Provinces a different nomenclature is employed, as Commissioner, Deputy Commissioner, Assistant Commissioner, and so on. The jurisdiction of a Munsiff is over all suits up to Rs. 1,000 (2,500 in Madras) and the District and Subordinate Judges have unlimited jurisdiction except in Bombay where there are no Munsiffs, but First and Second Class Subordinate Judges, the latter of whom exercise jurisdiction limited up to Rs. 5,000. The Courts of the Sub-judge and the District Munsiff are generally presided over by Native Officers who have received a legal education. The District Judge is generally a Covenanted Civilian who has ordinarily no legal education or training. He has Appellate jurisdiction over all suits tried by Munsiffs and in suits tried by

Sub-judges up to Rs. 5,000 in value. There is a provision in the Charters of the Chartered High Courts that at least a third of the judges of those Courts should be Covenanted Civilians and a similar provision that another third should be selected from Barristers of not less than five years' standing. It will be seen that while most of the smaller litigation is in the hands of Native Judicial Officers, much of the Appellate litigation is in the hands of European Civil Servants. It must also be pointed out that Munsiffs and Subordinate Judges are invested with Small Cause powers, that is, the power of disposing finally (subject to revision by the High Court on questions of law) of money claims analogous to the claims which fall within the jurisdiction of County Courts in England, up to a maximum limit of Rs. 500 in value. The Chartered High Courts except that of Allahabad exercise Original Jurisdiction within the Presidency towns. The whole Civil litigation of the country is thus in the hands of a hierarchy of Judges with varying powers and qualifications. Since the establishment of the Indian Universities in 1858 education has made vast progress in the country though it is true that educated Indians are a microscopic minority, amidst the vast population of the country. But it is a fact that thousands have received a high University training and many hundreds, if not thousands, a sound legal education. There is an entire consensus of opinion that the native judiciary have displayed high ability and integrity in the discharge of their judicial duties. The following extract from a speech by a former Lord Chancellor, the Earl of Selborne, will bear ample testimony. He said :—"My Lords, for some years I practised in Indian cases before the Judicial Committee of the Privy Council, and during those years there were few cases of any imperial importance in which I was not concerned. I had considerable opportunities of observing the manner in which, in Civil Cases, the Native Judges did their duty, and have no hesitation in saying, and I know this was also the opinion of the Judges during their time, that the judgments of the Native Judges bore most favourable comparison, as a general rule, with the judgment of the English Judges. I should be sorry to say anything in disparagement of the English Judges who, as a class, are most anxious to discharge their duty carefully; but I repeat that I have no hesitation in saying that in every instance, in respect of integrity, of learning, of knowledge, of the soundness and satisfactory character of the judgments arrived at, the judgments of the Native Judges were quite as good as those of English Judges."

The unsatisfactory feature in the constitution of the Courts is the exercise of Appellate powers by Civilian judges who possess little or no legal training and who by reason of administrative necessities are frequently shifted from one department to another without ever having had sufficient

time to acquire judicial experience and who possess no very intimate knowledge of the customs, manners, and the ways of thinking, of the people. On this point we take leave to quote the opinion of Sir Charles Paul, the Advocate General of Bengal :—

"It is a mistake in these advanced days to appoint a Civilian to high Judicial posts, which ought to be filled by properly trained and thoroughly experienced Barristers and Pleaders. What can an ordinary Civil Servant, however intelligent and well educated he may be, know of the tremendous complications and the innumerable technicalities, of a mixture of English, Hindu and Muhammedan Law? We have a number of codes all of a strictly technical character, based principally on English Law. Now it often happens that sectional orders issued by Government do not clearly and expressly state the law on the points to which they refer. It is taken for granted that the administrator—judge or Magistrate—knows the Law; but he frequently, being a Civilian, does not know it. It is absolutely necessary, therefore, for men who have to construe these sections to be acquainted with the principles on which they are founded. It is hopeless to except men, merely by the light of nature, to arrive at a proper interpretation of these sections. Many years of extensive practice, and a long familiarity with principles and cases, will alone fit a man for so great a task. I will here particularise the frequent unfamiliarity and want of acquaintance on the part of all non-professional Judges with the law of Evidence. Points of Law which arise in the course of examination of witnesses require to be readily decided. I do not think that under our present system there is sufficient ability or enlightenment for that purpose."

So long as education was in its infancy in the country, the necessity of dispensing equal and impartial justice required that people who by their character and antecedents and from the high salaries attached to their office were presumably free from bias of any sort should be invested with appellate powers even though somewhat deficient in legal knowledge and sound judicial acumen. But with the progress of the times, the qualities which were the peculiar property of highly placed Covenanted Civilians have become common in the ranks of the native judiciary and the defects of the old order have become glaringly manifest. The people of this country are sometimes charged with being litigious and the charge of habitual mendacity is also sometimes hurled at them. Without accepting these charges as true in any measure, it deserves to be mentioned that the siprit of litigation is fostered by the incompetency of the tribunals, when litigation becomes a game in which the just and the unjust litigant have even chances of success. If a sound decision of a Munsiff or a Subordinate Judge arrived at after patient

and elaborate investigation runs a fair chance of being reversed in appeal by an ill-informed and incompetent appellate authority, a premium is offered to reckless litigation. It has been generally recognised that this criticism as regards the competency of the Civilian Judges to discharge their duties as Civil Judges is not altogether unjust. The only obvious remedies of giving a judicial training or of insisting upon their passing a legal examination before they are entrusted with the duty of dispensing Civil Justice or of depriving them generally of the power of administering Civil justice have been hitherto deemed unattainable by reason of political or administrative considerations. Even in the constitution of the High Court, the Civilian element has come to be regarded as somewhat unequal. We must not be understood as laying down a proposition which affects every member of the class, for there have been distinguished members of the service who have achieved a reputation as Judges, not inferior to that of any Barrister Judge in this land. The prizes in the Executive branch of Government are more numerous and valuable and the Judgeships of the High Court are not sufficiently attractive to the men of talent in the Civil service. It is true in some Provinces, as in Bombay, some provision has been made by the local Government for a Judicial training being given to Civilian officers in certain Subordinate Judicial Offices before they are appointed District Judges. But this is the exception and not the rule. It would be impossible that the quality of European Judicial Officers could make any real improvement unless the Local Governments put a stop to frequent transfers from the Executive to the Judicial line and *vice versa* and unless the Civilans are obliged to elect once for all the particular line they will follow at an early stage of their career. Some provision should also be made for their acquiring a knowledge of Law before they are appointed to the responsible position of District Judges. For, at present, they have no Examination to pass to test their legal knowledge. It is a further question whether they cannot be relieved to a large extent of the duty of dealing with the Civil litigation of the country. The Chartered High Courts have had a great hold upon the confidence of the public. In recent years they have begun to lose some portion of that confidence. Barrister Judges have been sent to this country on account of political or personal friendship or party ties and not for proved legal attainments or keenness of judicial insight. Appointments are freely made by sucessive Secretaries of State, reckless of consequences, and the supreme importance of maintaining the reputation and prestige of the High Courts has been grievously overlooked.

This Judicial system with its ramifications and its system of appeals and second appeals, though the latter are limited to questions of law, presents a

more serious aspect in the costliness of Justice. We have made reference to the Courts of Small Causes which deal generally with money claims up to Rs. 500 in value. There are Village Courts in some provinces which are supposed to be the survivals of the ancient Village Panchayets, an optional *forum* for money claims below Rs. 10 or 20 in value. These village tribunals do not command the same amount of confidence as the regularly constituted Courts inspire. But their constitution was not till recently rested upon a popular basis ; and the fact that the tribunal is only optional induces the plaintiff to select the most costly *forum* to make the defeat of the defendant more painful or burdensome. It has been calculated that in suits of small value which form by far the vast majority of the litigation of the country, the successful man fails to recover about 50 p. c. of the actual cost he incurs and the unsuccessful party has to bear a burden which is much in excess of the claim he has to answer. Such a state of things cannot but result in the ruin of both parties, more especially if the litigation is carried through several tribunals allured by the prospect of incompetent appellate Judges deciding one way or the other, almost as a matter of chance. That a strong effort should be made towards reducing the number of appeals in petty litigations and that there should be a substantial strengthening of the Court of first instance is the feeling of many an educated man who has given his attention to the study of the subject. Dewan Bahadur Sreenivasaraghava Iyengar, C. I. E., the distinguished Dewan of Baroda, in his very able Memorandum on the Progress of the Madras Presidency during the last 40 years, observes :—" The law should be amended so as to make it compulsory on suitors to institute their suits in the village Courts in all villages or groups of villages where a village Court Bench has been established when the value of the claim does not exceed Rs. 20. It ought not to be in the power of a plaintiff who wishes to annoy a defendant to compel him to appear before a District Munsif to answer a claim and subject him to all the vexation and expense incidental to being called away from his village and his work, when there is a Village Court at a convenient distance. The constitution of a Bench, of which one of the Judges is chosen by the defendant and another by the plaintiff, is a reasonable guarantee for securing the impartiality of the tribunal and in special cases the District Munsif has the power of withdrawing, for reasons shown, a suit from a Village Court for trial before himself. As regards suits involving claims exceeding Rs. 20 and not exceeding Rs. 50, the plaintiff may be given the option of instituting them either in the Village or the District Munsif's Court, but in such cases, if a suit is instituted unnecessarily in a District Munsif's Court, the Munsif should have the power of refusing costs to the plaintiff or of allowing only

such costs as would have been incurred if he had instituted the suit in the Village Court." A similar provision has been enacted in the Madras City Civil Court's Act, the Presidency Small Cause Courts' Act and in the County Courts' Act in England. Speaking of higher litigation, the same writer observes : "The necessity for ensuring full consideration of the facts and of the legal aspects of each case as well as rectitude of decision, by tribunals in the rural tracts presided over by single paid Judges not amenable to the influence of public opinion, has led to the provision of an elaborate system of appeals ; and this has in its turn given rise to serious evils." He proceeds to suggest that the regular Courts of first instance should be presided over by two judges so as to ensure careful and conscientious sifting of the facts and, consequently to dispense with appeals in a larger percentage of cases of a petty character.

Among the several causes of the expensiveness of litigation which tends to impoverish the successful as well as the unsuccessful litigant is the enormous tax upon justice in the shape of Court Fees from which an aggregate amount is derived equal to the cost of the whole judicial establishments in the country, Civil and Criminal. The latest statistical abstract of the Government of India gives the following figures. The total receipts of Courts is Rs. 34,549,890 and the total charge is Rs. 34,970,612 during the year 1896–7. This enormous tax has been strongly animadverted upon by Sir Richard Garth, a former Chief Justice of Bengal. It goes without saying that the expenses of the administration of Criminal Justice should be met out of the general Revenues of the state, for, the security of person and property in which every citizen is interested should be paid for by him and the Civil Suitor ought not to be mulcted to pay for the administration of Criminal Justice. Apart from the question whether the general public is not also interested in the efficient administration of Civil Justice so as to justify a contribution from the General Exchequer towards the cost of Civil Justice, it seems altogether absurd that the civil litigant should pay nearly twice as much as it costs the Government to keep the Civil judicial establishments going so as to leave a large surplus sufficient to cover the cost of the Criminal administration of the country as well. The argument of the Government of India is, we suppose, that it is only a matter of accounts, that if you take more from the General Revenues and less from the Civil litigant, you should devise other means of taxation to add to the General Revenues, enough to cover the increased expenditure. But we venture to think that this is altogether fallacious. It is an odious step to devise any measure of general taxation ; and Government has to justify every item of expenditure before resorting to it, while it is easier to tax the civil litigant

who is unable to evoke the sympathy of public opinion. It is furthermore a question whether it is not treating particular individuals harshly for the general purposes of the State. The costliness of justice, enhanced in several ways by the Court fees levied and the system of appeals, ought to be reduced at any cost. While the revision of the Court Fees Act is imperatively called for so as to reduce the pressure of taxation upon the litigant, the Courts of first instance should also be strengthened so as to dispense with appeals in a larger percentage of cases.

One other feature of the administration of Civil justice consists in the enactment ot Laws which have tended in no small measure to defeat the dispensing of even-handed justice upon the merits of each case. It appears to us that the Court Fees and Registration Acts, the Limitation Act and the Code of Civil Procedure are responsible for a great amount of injustice and the people of this country cannot understand how legal quibbles and refinements based upon a foreign jurisprudence are to subserve the ends of justice, when they often find that by some technicality the just man is robbed of his rights and the astute, but dishonest, litigant comes out successful from the forum established by Law. It is a disgrace to the administration of justice in any country that the merits of any quarrel should not be pronounced upon and that failure to conform to some subtle requirement of the law should turn the scale against the honest litigant. It is a common enough observation that the man with a long purse has a much greater chance of success than his poor adversary. But it is a serious blemish disfiguring the administration of justice if you add to it what is sometimes called legal chicane to defeat the honest claims of a just man. It is perhaps not ordinarily known outside legal circles of how much injustice the Laws of Procedure and Limitation have been the parents. Of course it goes without saying that there ought to be some limitation to Civil claims and that some simple procedure should be followed to enforce them. But the variety of periods provided by the Limitation Act with the consequent difficulty of deciding whether a case falls within one or the other article providing a longer or shorter period has defeated justice in many a case where it was at last pronounced by the Court of last resort that the man had elected the wrong period. There is no justification except upon some supposed idea of theoretical completeness for any body being defeated on account of the difficulty of determining what particular period of limitation applies to his case; and yet hundreds are the cases to be found in the reports where such injustice has been perpetrated, not to speak of thousands which have not found their way into the pages of any legal publication. How many are the cases where, by reason of some error of procedure, a litigant has been

told at last that he cannot have his remedy except in some new suit differently framed or differently carried through. There have no doubt been efforts made by the Legislature to provide against miscarriage of justice in cases of this sort, as in the enactment of the Suits Valuation Act, where error of jurisdiction is cured or the enactment of Section 578 of the Code of Civil Procedure where errors of Procedure are condoned. It seems to us that it is high time to appoint a Commission for the purpose of simplifying the laws of Procedure and Limitation and the Court Fees and Registration Laws. It is impossible to describe adequately how much injustice has been perpetrated in the name of the Court Fees Act. That Act is a puzzle to most legal practitioners and to almost all the judges in the land. It is impossible, in many a case, to state definitely, what stamp should be paid in a particular case so as to exclude the possibility of a reasonable difference of opinion with the presiding judge; and the penalty for any error of judgment, if the period of limitation has expired at the time of the discovery of the supposed deficiency, is the summary dismissal of the claim. If the Courts below have committed a mistake in levying less stamp than should be paid, the Appellate Court has the power, and is bound, to levy the deficiency. But if the Lower Court has unjustly charged and levied more, the over-taxed litigant has no chance of a refund. The Indian reports bristle with cases of construction of the Stamp, Registration, Limitation and Procedure Laws in which the High Courts are frequently divided in opinion and this unhealthy growth is a strong indication of a disease which cannot but foster an unhealthy spirit of litigation throughout the country for the chance of success upon some legal quibble. A Commission of able and experienced officials with an admixture of some non-official gentlemen imbued with the best principles of scientific jurispudence should examine into the working of our laws in order to place them upon a sound and satisfactory footing. It ought to be a matter of earnest solicitude to the Government that the sound and impartial administration of justice which is one of the proudest titles of England's right to govern India should not be sullied by defects and drawbacks which impede the beneficent results that must otherwise flow from the spirit of English institutions in the light of which this country is administered.

We pass on now to the administration of Criminal Justice. The Indian Penal Code (supplemented by numerous local laws) which is the proud achievement of Macaulay's genius and which in its wonderful elabor.tion of the definitions of crimes and its scale of drastic punishments came like a thunderbolt from the blue upon the people of this country, has during the last 40 years been somewhat better understood and appreciated than in the

consternation which it created at the time when it was passed into law. But few people of this country have been able to reconcile themselves to the punishments provided by the Code which range, in many instances, from the smallest to the highest and give to individual Judges and Magistrates a latitude of discretion which in the assertion of individual idiosyncrasies has resulted in the infliction of grievous punishments for barely civil wrongs. It was observed by the late Mr Rangacharlu, Dewan of Mysore and one of the foremost statesmen produced by this country in recent years :—

"Popular experience can only describe the Code as a cruel piece of legislation which, in its anxiety that no description of offence might possibly be left out, has framed such wide and comprehensive definitions as to mingle serious crimes and mere Civil injuries in the same category, and in order that all aggravated cases might be adequately met, has provided for offences exorbitant and often unlimited fines and imprisonment. It has thus placed the peaceful citizen equally with the professional dacoit perpetually under the tender mercies of a not immaculate official hierarchy. No one can be sure that any momentary indiscreet act of his might not bring him under the the grasp of the Penal Code, and in so bringing him consign him to a punishment, which, to him, may be a social death, under the prevailing ideas of religion and custom. Where there is such unlimited latitude of punishment, it is vain to expect that it will be properly exercised. A simpler code keeping to popular ideas, with certainty rather than severity of punishment in all ordinary cases, with exceptional powers confined to special courts, is the want of the country".

Mr. Sreenivasa Raghava Iyengar whom we have already quoted adds the following to the above quotation .—

"During the last 30 years the experience of the working of the Code has led to its provisions being better understood, and it does not inspire the terror that it once did. Even now, however, as regards the punishments prescribed for some offences, the provision as to certain offences being non-bailable and the compulsory enforcement of the attendance of women without distinction of caste or rank, the Penal Code and the Code of Criminal Procedure are unsuited to the prevailing ideas of tl e people and their social and religious usages. The consequence of refusing bail to many a Hindu charged with a non-bailablə offence, is in some parts of the country, excommunication, a punishment far in excess of the requirements of the offence of which he may or may not be convicted. The fear of compulsory personal attendance in Courts, of respectable women, as parties, or witnesses, is an encouragement to false or vexatious Criminal proceedings. And the purchase of immunity from this disgrace by pecuniary payments is a not unlooked-for

result in the institution of such proceedings."

We need add nothing to the eloquent remarks we have quoted to justify our opinion as regards the working of the Criminal law. We are doubtless aware of the wisdom of educating public opinion up to the standard of morality laid down by the criminal law of the land instead of pandering to caste or racial prejudices by lowering the standard of the law itself. But where the disparity is great, sound principles of administration require that the law should have the sympathy of the people. The barbarous criminal law of England of the *Pre-Benthamite* days was moderated, if not neutralised by the humanity of English juries acting in the teeth of the injunctions of the law. But alien administrators of the criminal law in this Country unacquainted, and out of sympathy, with the feelings and prejudices of the people cannot but inflict grievous wrong by the harsh administration of the criminal law. It is largely administered by European Sessions Judges and Magistrates of the 1st, 2nd, or 3rd Class, there being a right of appeal in sessions cases to the High Courts of the respective Provinces. Trials of Sessions cases in the Presidency towns are only by Jury and in the Sessions Courts by a Jury or by a Judge assisted by assessors according to the description of the offence at the discretion of the Local Government. The 1st, 2nd, and 3rd Class Magistrates are either European Civil servants or Natives. Most of the Criminal appellate work is done by European Magistrates or Judges. A Native of India cannot claim to be tried by a Jury as a matter of right except in the Presidency Towns, while a European British subject can claim such a right in any criminal case. This is a relic of unequal treatment of accused persons which has survived the days of the Company's rule and which in recent controversies has been sought to be justified and accentuated though it is utterly at variance with the spirit of English law. Because trial by jury is called an exotic institution or it is supposed to be descredited as an efficient instrument of Justice in some cases in England or the United States, the Indian subject of Her Majesty is denied the privilege of being tried by his compeers. But it appears to us that the true reason for the denial of this right is rather based upon political considerations than upon the unfitness of the tribunals for dealing efficiently with Criminal cases. It is believed that the exercise of Criminal powers is an essential part of the government of the country and that the power to punish according to the judgment of the rulers and the political exigencies of the times ought to be in the hands of the rulers and not of the prisoner's countrymen. Differences of race and of religion and the animosity of rival sects have sometimes been made to do duty for arguments in justification of the denial of the privilege. It seems to us that these have nothing to do with the determination of the

question. Comments on the incompetency of the Jury or the absurdity of their verdicts are common in every country. Any miscarriage of justice resulting from inefficiency or the want of a conscientious resolve to do the right on the part of a Jury will be more than compensated by their judgment in the large majority of cases representing the cultivated moral sense of the representatives of one's own people. The Criminal law will thus be brought to the conscience of each man and its administration will enlist the entire sympathy of the people. Trial by Jury again educates every citizen in a proper appreciation of his duties and responsibilities. These are the best justification of Trial by Jury in this as well as in any other country notwithstanding occasional miscarriages of justice. It is not difficult to provide against them by reserving a power to the High Court to examine the cases where there has been gross and palpable failure of justice or by reserving to the Sessions Judge the right as now to refer cases in which he differs from the Jury, for the opinion of the High Court. Again it deserves to be noted that the Crown has now the right of appeal in every criminal case to the High Court from an acquittal in the Court below. Every case in which after an acquittal by the Subordinate Court the High Court comes to a different conclusion and condemns the prisoner is apt to create a sense of injustice in the popular mind, for, after all, it is a difference between two Courts as to the guilt or innocence of the prisoner, and the principle of English Law that the benefit of the doubt is to be given to the prisoner is rudely overthrown. The right of appeal against acquittal should also be limited to cases of palpable failure of justice.

In recent years another question in connexion with the administration of Criminal justice has bulked very large and has received considerable attention, in England as well as in India. We refer to what is known as the question of the separation of Judicial from Executive functions. Readers of "India" must have become familiar with the arguments in favour of separation. For it has been advocated by retired Anglo-Indians of eminence with a fulness of knowledge and an amount of earnestness which no other subject relating to the administration of India has commanded. Elaborate schemes have been set forth and pamphlets scattered broadcast by eminent Indians like Mr. Romesh Chunder Dutt and the late Mr. Mano Mohun Ghose. The great evil of the combination of these two functions was deeply felt by distinguished British statesmen, when the question was brought up for discussion before the House of Lords. The debate on that occasion was interesting and it brought out clearly the grave miscarriage of justice which had resulted from the incongruous union of the two functions.

A former Chief Justice of Bengal, Sir Richard Garth, realised the mischief

of this combination and the following remarks taken from an article of his will be found to be very much in point.

"Imagine an active young of magistrate, having heard of some daring robbery, which has alarmed the neighbourhood, taking counsel in the first place with the heads of the Police with view to discovering the offender. After two or three vain attempts he succeeds at last, as he firmly believes, in finding the right man; and he then, still in concert with the police suggests enquiries, receives information, hunts up evidence, through their agency, for the purpose of bringing home the charge to the suspected person. Having thus done his duty zealously in the first stage of the case, he next proceeds to enquire, as a Magistrate, whether the evidence, which he himself has collected, is sufficient to justify a committal. And, having come to the conclusion, not unnaturally, that it is, he afterwards upon the self same evidence, tries the prisoner in his Judicial capacity, without the assistance, of a Jury and convicts him. However monstrous this may appear to an English public, the picture which I have presented is by no means overdrawn.

It is not that the Indian public have any want of confidence in European officers as such. But to be tried by a man who is at once the Judge and the prosecutor is too glaring an injustice; and it is only wonderful that a system so indefensible should have been allowed to prevail thus long under an English Government."

It seems only in accordance with reason, that magistrates who are employed upon executive work, should be under the chief executive officer of each District; and that those who are employed in judical work, should be under the chief judical officer. To make courts of criminal justice subservient to police authority, is upon the face of it a dangerous anomaly. To make a judge's promotion dependent on the favour of the chief police officer, is a direct and most unwholesome incentive to him to gratify his master's wishes; and so long as criminal courts are virtually under police control, it is hopeless to expect from them either justice or independence.

We may also quote here the views of Adam Smith, the father of English Political Economy:

"When the Judicial is united to the Executive power, it is scarcely possible that justice should not frequently be sacrificed to what is vulgarly called politics. The persons entrusted with the great interests of the State may even without any corrupt views sometimes imagine it necessary to sacrifice to those interests the rights of a private man. But upon the impartial administration of justice depends the liberty to every individual, the sense which he has of his own security. In order to make every individual feel himself perfectly secure in the possession of every right which belongs to him, it is not only necessary that the judicial should be separated from the executive power, but that it should be rendered as much as possible independent of that power."

It has been conclusively shewn that the separation will involve no administrative weakness or increased financial burden. It has even received the approval of two Viceroys, namely the Marquis of Dufferin and the Marquis of Lansdowne. Some feeble and tentative attempts have also been made in that direction by the Government of Madras, which have been entirely crowned with success. The gist of the whole matter is whether persons who are in some measure heads of the Police and who combine in themselves several offices which sometimes gives them a substantial interest in the conviction of the accused shall masquerade before the public as impartial Judicial

officers, with no manner of bias, in the determination of the criminal proceedings. Most magistrates in the country are also Revenue officers and the European Magistrates have numerous other functions to perform besides their judicial duties. Says Mr. R. C. Dutt:

"The District Officer is the head of the Police in his District; he directs investigation into heinous cases; he receives and peruses diaries sent up by investigating Police Officers he forms his opinion of the case from the perusal of these Police Diaries; and if the case appears to him to be true, he directs the case to be sent up for trial. When the case comes, the District Officer sends it to one of his own Subordinate Magistrates for trial, and he prosecutes the case through a Subordinate Police Officer. If the Subordinate Magistrate who tries the case is what is known in India as a Second Class or a Third Class Magistrate, and if he convicts the prisoner, the prisoner's appeal lies to the District Officer. We shall suppose that his appeal is rejected, and a sentence of hard labour passed on him is confirmed; the District Officer is again the Head of the Local Gaol, and sees how the prisoner is worked in Gaol. To sum up, the District Officer is the Police Officer who directs the police investigation; he is the superior Magistrate who has the prisoner tried by his own Subordinate; he is the prosecutor who prosecutes the prisoner, he is the appellate Court who hears the appeal if the prisoner is tried by a Second or third Class Magistrate; and he is the head Gaoler who superintends the prisoner's work in the Gaol."

The trouble and expense to the unfortunate accused person who is to follow a peripatetic Magistrate from camp to camp to whom the exercise of Magisterial functions is of secondary importance, is enormous even if he happens not to be prejudiced in his defence by any decided proclivities of the presiding functionary. It is generally accepted among well-informed circles that the combination of several duties in one official tends to the perversion of justice and even to the perpetration of acts of oppression. The agitation for separation has been christened "a counsel of perfection". One would suppose if really financial considerations were in the way, some portion of the Revenues that are diverted towards the Frontier Expeditions or towards the maintenance of costly Military Establishments might be set free for the carrying out of a reform on which the opinion of all classes is practically unanimous. Here again, as in other matters, the apology that is laid before the public is not the true reason for the supineness or the indifference of the Government. There seems to be an impression that the combination of these functions is essential for the maintenance of the prestige of the paramount power. On this we have confession of Sir Charles Elliot a former Lieutenant Governor of Bengal. A more unfounded assumption, it is difficult to conceive; and yet this is an instance among others of pre-conceived ideas governing the action of the authorities instead of sound principles of government or the results of past experience. We have no space in this paper for illustrations of grave injustice wrought by the union of these functions. They have been fully and freely dilated upon in successive congresses of men of light and leading in this land, held in various parts of the country.

The object of this paper has been, as set forth in the beginning, to present the bad features of the administration of justice and not the vast improvement it has made upon the condition of things which the British regime has displaced. It is not human nature to rest content with the contemplation of the past or the feeling of satisfaction arising from the beneficent changes that have been made within the last half century. Progress is impossible where there is stagnation. It is the essential condition of every reform that it should be preceded by intelligent discontent. Such discontent can never be rightly characterised as ingratitude. We have had space to point out only some of the leading defects of the present administration in the Department of Justice. We feel confident that a careful and impartial survey of the situation will lead every candid reader to the conclusions at which we have arrived.

THE STATUS OF BRITISH INDIANS ABROAD.

G. PARAMESWARAN PILLAI, Esq., B.A.,
(*Editor of the "Madras Standard."*)

Though natives of India are known to be conservative and have the reputation of being a stay-at-home population, they have emigrated to other lands attracted by wealth, learning or labour and even made them the lands of their adoption. The object of this article is to enquire how far the rights of British Indians have been recognised or respected in places to which they have emigrated

Several Indians are bound to Europe and particularly the British Isles every year. Most of them go there for purposes of study and a few have settled down in England; but whether their stay is temporary or permanent, their rights as British Indians are fully respected and even the doors of the House of Commons are open to them.

The continent of America is less attractive to Indians but Demerara in British Guiana and Surinam or Dutch Guiana both situated in South America and the Islands of Jamaica and Trinidad in the West Indies have been attracting a large number of Indian labourers every year. The labourers are imported into these colonies under a covenant that they would serve for a fixed number of years at the end of which they should be provided with a free passage to India if they wish to return home. A slight change was introduced into these conditions by the colonies of Demerara and Trinidad in 1895-96. It has been ruled that emigrants returning from Demerara and Trinidad after 10 years' residence in the Colony or holding a certificate of exemption from labour, should for the future, pay the men one fourth, and the women one-sixth, of the passage money, the destitute however, being sent back free. It has also been provided that after five years' residence, or by holding a certificate of exemption, an emigrant may return at his own cost. The other colonies, of which, it will be noted, one is Dutch, provide a free passage after 10 years' residence. The British colony of Jamaica has not introduced any change in the law evidently because the number of labourers imported into that colony has always been comparatively few and in 1896-97 it took none.

In Oceania, the only countries to which Indians emigrate are Australia and Fiji Islands. In Fiji the same laws that prevail in the American Colonies of Jamaica and Surinam hold good; Indian labourers are provided with a

free passage after ten years. New South Wales and Western Australia have passed Acts restricting the immigration of Indians, which have received the assent of Her Majesty the Queen : and Victoria is now engaged in the consideration of a similar Act which proposes the exclusion of "any person who, when asked to do so, shall fail to write out in his own handwriting in some European language" his application claiming exemption from the operation of the Act.

The places in Asia, to which Indians freely emigrate are Ceylon and the Straits Settlements and, to a much smaller extent, Japan. In Ceylon and the Straits Settlements, Indians enjoy the same liberty as other British subjects and the enlightened Government of Japan have imposed no restrictions on Indians. But curiously enough, one of the effects of the new treaty concluded between Great Britain and Japan about four years ago, and which will come into operation next year, is that British Indians are denied certain rights that are accorded to other British subjects. According to this treaty, British subjects are allowed the privilege of trade, travel and residence in the whole of Japan with certain exceptions ; but as India was excluded from the treaty and neither the Imperial nor the Indian Government cared to take the necessary steps to bring her under the treaty, which they could have done by giving timely notice within two years after the treaty was concluded, British Indians are entitled to enter only the treaty ports in Japan for purposes of trade, travel and residence—that is, the ports which were open to British subjects according to the first treaty between Great Britain and Japan in 1858.

Africa has attracted a much larger number of British Indians than any other continent. It is in Africa that Indians have settled in large numbers as traders, labourers and other professional men, and it is here that the rights and privileges of British Indians have been doubted, disputed and unnecessarily restricted. The colonies in which Indians have settled are the British colonies of Natal and Cape Colony, the Crown Colony of Zululand, the republics of the Transvaal and Orange Free State and the Portuguese territories of Delagoa Bay, Beira and the Mozambique. Besides these, there are the Uganda and East Africa Protectorate which for the first time in 1896–97 took in 3,900 labourers from India and the island of Mauritius to which labourers, particularly from South India, have been for a long number of years emigrating.

The self-governing colony of Natal has according to the latest census an Indian population of about 51,000 of whom 30,000 are free Indians, that is, those who have finished their term of indentured service and are engaged in different pursuits of life, 5,000 are traders who entered the colony as such and

the remainder are serving their term as labourers. The indentured Indians, according to the law that was in force in the colony till 1896-97, were required to serve their employer for a period of five years; and if they continued their service in the colony for another term of five years, they became entitled to a free passage back to India. But, according to the present law which has received the sanction of the Government of India, all emigrants have to bind themselves to return to India after five years when they are allowed a free passage; should they, however, prefer to remain in Natal they should either bind themselves to a further period of re-indenture or take out licenses annually at a cost of £ 3 sterling. These changes were proposed by the Natal Government with some hesitation as they thought it was by no means easy to induce the Government of India to accede to them, prejudicial as they were to the Indians, but the Commissioners who were deputed to obtain the permission of the Government of India had no difficulty in obtaining the Viceroy's sanction. In fact, a commission which was appointed about eleven years ago by the then Governor of Natal to report on matters connected with Indian immigration, thought that any such measure would be a "cruel wrong to Indians": yet that objectionable measure is the law to-day in Natal.

This, however, is not the only measure that the Natal Government have passed to restrict the rights of Indian immigrants. In 1897, consequent on the agitation of the claims of Indians in South Africa by Mr. Ghandi in India and the general attention that the subject had received in this country, the Government of Natal passed three Acts which, without mentioning the Indians specifically, were framed merely with a view to restrict their free entry into the colony for purposes of residence, travel or trade. The first Act which is said to be a Quarantine Act runs as follows:—

(1) Whenever any place has been proclaimed under Law 4, 1882, as an infected place, the Governor in Council may, by a further proclamation, order that no person shall be landed from any ship coming from such place. (2) Any such order shall also extend to a ship having on board passengers who have come from a proclaimed place, notwithstanding that they may have embarked at some other place or that the ship has not touched at the proclaimed place (3). Any such order as aforesaid shall be in force until revoked by a further proclamation. (4) Any person who shall land in contravention of this Act, shall, if practicable, be at once returned to the ship in which he came to Natal; and the master of such ship shall be bound to receive such person on board and to convey him from the Colony at the expense of the owners of the ship. (5) The master and owners of any vessel from which any person shall be landed in contravention of this Act

shall be liable to a penalty of not less than one hundred pounds sterling for each person so landed, and the vessel may be made executable by a decree of the Supreme Court in satisfaction of any such penalty ; and the vessel may be refused a clearance outwards until such penalty has been paid, and until provision has been made by the master for the conveyance out of the Colony of each person who have may been so landed.

The second Act relates to licenses for trade but the object aimed at clearly is to prevent the free issue of licenses to Indians. It runs thus :—

(1) Any Town Council or Town Board may, from time to time, appoint an officer to issue the annual licenses (not being licenses under Act 38, 1896) required in the borough or township by wholesale or retail dealers. (2.) Any person appointed to issue licenses for wholesale or retail dealers under Law 38, 1884, or any like Stamp Act, or under this Act, shall be deemed to be a "licensing officer" within the meaning of this Act, (3) A licensing officer shall have a discretion to issue or refuse a wholesale or retail license not being a license under Act 38, 1896, and a decision come to by a licensing officer as to the issue or refusal of a license shall not be liable to review, reversal, or alteration by any court of law, or otherwise than is in the next section provided. (4) There shall be a right of appeal from the decision of a licensing officer to the Colonial Secretary as regards licenses issuable under Law 38,1884, or other similar Act, and in other cases to the Town Council or Town Board, according to the circumstances, and the Colonial Secretary, or, as the case may be, the Town Council or the Town Board, may direct that the license, the subject of appeal, shall be issued or cancelled. (5) No license shall be issued to any person who, when thereto required, fails to show to the satisfaction of the licensing officer that he is able to fulfil the conditions of the Insolvency Law, 47, 1887, section 180, sub-section (*a*), as regards the keeping of such books of account in the English language as are usual and proper in the business to be carried on. (6) No license shall be issued in respect of premises which are unfit for the intended trade or unprovided with proper and sufficient sanitary arrangements, or not affording sufficient and suitable accommodation for salesmen, clerks, and servants, apart from the stores or rooms in which goods and wares may be kept. (7) Any person who shall carry on any wholesale or retail trade or business, or who shall allow licensed premises to be in a condition which would disentitle him to a license, shall be deemed to have contravened this act and shall be liable to a penalty of £ 20 for each offence, to be recovered by any licensing officer in the Court of the Magistrate.

It will be observed that the fifth clause of the above Act is framed with a view to prevent licenses being issued to Indian traders many of whom are

not able to keep their accounts in English.

The third Act was enacted with the object of restricting immigration. It runs as follows:—

1. This act may be known as "The Immigration Restriction Act, 1897.'

2. This Act shall not apply to:—

(*a*) Any person possessed of a certificate in the form set out in the Schedule A to this Act annexed, and signed by the Colonial Secretary, or the Agent-General of Natal, or any officer appointed by the Natal Government for the purposes of this Act whether in or out of Natal.

(*b*) Any person of a class for whose immigration into Natal provision is made by law or by a scheme approved by Government.

(*c*) Any person specially exempted from the operation of this Act by a writing under the hand of the Colonial Secretary.

(*d*) Her Majesty's land and sea forces.

(*e*) The officers and crew of any ship of war of any Government.

(*f*) Any persons duly accredited to Natal by or under the authority of the Imperial or any other Government.

3. The immigration into Natal, by land or sea, of any person of any of the classes defined in the following subsections, hereinafter called "prohibited immigrant," is prohibited, namely,

(*a*) Any person who, when asked to do so by an officer appointed under this Act, shall fail to himself write out and sign in the characters of any language of Europe an application to the Colonial Secretary in the form set out in Schedule B of this Act.

(*b*) Any person being a pauper or likely to become a public charge.

(*c*) Any idiot or insane person.

(*d*) Any person suffering from a loathsome or a dangerous contagious disease.

(*e*) Any person who, not having received a free pardon, has within two years been convicted of a felony or other infamous crime or misdemeanour involving moral turpitude, and not being a mere political offence.

(*f*) Any prostitute, and any person living on the prostitution of others.

4. Any prohibited immigrant making his way into or being found within Natal, in disregard of the provisions of this Act shall be deemed to have contravened this Act and shall be liable in addition to any other penalty, to be removed from the Colony, and upon conviction may be sentenced to imprisonment not exceeding six months without hard labour: Provided that such imprisonment shall cease for the purpose of deportation of the offender, or if he shall find two approved sureties, each in the sum of fifty pounds sterling, that he will leave the Colony within one month.

5. Any person appearing to be a prohibited immigrant within the meaning of Section 3 of this Act and not coming within the meaning of any of the sub-sections (*c*), (*d*), (*e*), (*f*) of the said Section 3 shall be allowed to enter Natal upon the following conditions :—

(*a*) He shall, before landing, deposit with an officer appointed under this Act the sum of one hundred pounds sterling.

(*b*) If such person shall within one week after entering Natal, obtain from the Colonial Secretary or a Magistrate, a certificate that he does not come within the prohibition of this Act, the deposit of one hundred pounds sterling shall be returned.

(*c*) If such person shall fail to obtain such certificate within one week, the deposit of one hundred pounds sterling may be forfeited, and he may be treated as a prohibited immigrant.

Provided that, in the case of any person entering Natal under this section, no liability shall attach to the vessel or to the owners of the vessel in which he may have arrived at any port of the Colony.

6. Any person who shall satisfy an officer appointed under this Act that he has been formerly domiciled in Natal, and that he does not come within the meaning of any of the sub-sections (*c*), (*d*), (*e*), (*f*), of Section 3 of this Act, shall not be regarded as a prohibited immigrant.

7. The wife and any minor child of a person not being a prohibited immigrant shall be free from any prohibition imposed by this Act.

8. The master and owners of any vessel from which any prohibited immigrant may be landed shall be jointly and severally liable to a penalty of not less than one hundred pounds sterling, and such penalty may be increased up to five thousand pounds sterling, by sums of one hundred pounds sterling each, for every five prohibited immigrants after the first five, and the vessel may be made executable by a decree of the Supreme Court in satisfaction of any such penalty, and the vessel may be refused a clearance outwards until such penalty has been paid, and until provision has been made by the master, to the satisfaction of an officer appointed under this Act, for the conveyance out of the Colony of each prohibited immigrant who may have been so landed.

In the above Act it will be observed that 3 (*a*) is specially intended to prohibit the immigration of Indians.

Though there is no mention of British Indians in any of the three Acts, it is not difficult to see that they were undoubtedly intended to apply to them. If however any proof is necessary to show that such was the object intended, we may quote what the then Prime Minister, Rt. Hon. Harry Escombe, said, on the occasion of the introduction of the Immigration Act

"It had been authoritatively affirmed that no Government dreamt of applying the Law to Europeans...The object, however, was to deal with Asiatics. Some people said they liked an honest straight-forward course. When a ship was heading against a wind she had to tack, and by and by she reached her goal. When a man met difficulties he fought against them, and, if he could not knock them over, he went round them instead of breaking his head against a brick wall."

To this Sir Henry Binns, the present Prime Minister retorted:—"They ought," he said, "to guard against taking a purely local view of so serious a question. The Bill was not straight, and nothing could be more appropriate than the remark that was made in the petition read that afternoon that it was un-British. Nobody liked the Bill. There was not a man in Natal that liked the Bill, and the Prime Minister certainly did not like it. He might think that there was necessity for it, and that the Bill should assume the form it had done. But if there was one thing clear in his speech it was that he did not like the Bill." However, Sir Henry Binns' arguments were of no avail. All the bills have been passed and they have become part of the law of the land.

Similar attempts have also been made by the Government of Natal to deprive Indians of their electoral rights. Till 1894, British Indians enjoyed full electoral privileges in Natal like all other British subjects. But in 1894 an Act was passed disqualifying persons of Asiatic extraction from having their names inserted in any voters' list. This Act however, was subsequently cancelled and another Act introduced in its place which like the Immigration and other Acts mentioned above, while not mentioning British Indians specifically, operates against them. This Franchise Act which is the one now in force in Natal runs as follows:—"No persons shall be qualified to have their names inserted in any list of electors who (not being of European origin) are natives or descendants in the male line of natives of countries which have not hitherto possessed elective representative institutions founded on the Parliamentary franchise unless they shall first obtain an order from the Governor in Council exempting them from the operation of this Act." It was contended by the Indians resident in Natal that British Indians enjoyed in India the "privilege of representative institutions founded on the Parliamentary franchise" but the Natal authorities have ruled otherwise.

There are also other laws in Natal which have lowered the status of British Indians in that Colony. According to Act No. 15 of 1869, no coloured person unless he can give a good account of himself or unless he can produce a pass from his employer shall be out at night after 9 o'clock. This law is

so rigorously and unreasonably enforced that several respectable Indians have been locked up in dungeons. There is also another law which provides that every Indian can be asked to produce a pass. These laws have all been worked to the prejudice of Indians and great is the hardship to which they have been subject on that account. According to the Constitution Act of Natal, no Acts which have for their object class legislation and which curtail the right of non-European British subjects shall have the force of law unless they are sanctioned by Her Majesty and as a matter of course, all these Acts have been forwarded to Her Majesty's Secretary of State for the Colonies for approval. But singular as it may seem, they have all been sanctioned in spite of the protests of the Indians in Natal. It does not look as if the Government of Natal are satisfied with what they have done to restrict the rights of Indians. There are indications that the lines on which they will next legislate against Indians are the adoption of measures to prevent them from acquiring land in the Colony. With reference to a resolution on the subject passed recently by the Anti-Asiatic Committee and the Natal Progressive League and communicated to Government, the Chief Under-Secretary to Government has said "I am to inform you that the question of adopting measures to prevent Asiatics from acquiring land in the Colony will receive the careful consideration of the Government."

The status of British Indians in the colony of the Cape of Good Hope or the Cape Colony as it is called, is not much better than in Natal. It contains a population of 1,800,000 persons of whom about 10,000 are Indians. In 1894, the Government of the Cape passed an Act authorising the East London Municipality to frame by-laws prohibiting Indians from walking on footpaths and compelling them to live in specified locations. Indians also find it extremely difficult to obtain licenses for trade as the Magistrates refuse them without giving any reasons and the decision of the Magistrates is upheld by the Government. Not satisfied with these restractions, Mr. Schreiner the present Premier of the Cape has announced his intention to convene a conference of the South African States for the purpose of securing common action in dealing with the immigration of Asiatics. He thinks that the Natal immigration Act does not safeguard South African interests sufficiently.

The Crown Colony of Zululand has followed the wake of Natal and Cape Colony. There are several townships established in this colony but the regulations issued by Government provide that only persons of European birth and descent shall be approved as occupiers of sites in these townships. In the township of Melmonth, Indians bought pieces of land to the value of about £ 2,000 but they were prevented from occupying those sites. Indians are thus totally excluded from this colony. The Gold Mining laws of Zululand

also make it criminal for an Indian to buy or possess Native Gold.

The Transvaal or the South African Republic though governed by the Dutch is under the suzerainty of Her Majesty the Queen. There are about 5,000 Indians who have settled down in this Republic as traders, hawkers, cooks, and labourers. According to Article 14 of the London Convention of 1884, it was enacted that "all persons other than natives conforming themselves to the laws of the South African Republic will have full liberty with their families to enter, travel or reside in any part of the Transvaal State. They will be entitled to hire or possess houses, manufactories, warehouses, shops, premises. They may carry on their commerce either in person or by any agents they may think fit to employ. They will not be subject in respect of their persons and property, in respect of their commerce and industry to any taxes whether general or local other than those which are or may be imposed upon the Transvaal citizens." According to this Convention, Indian settlers enjoyed all the privileges enjoyed by British subjects. But in 1883, the Transvaal Government with the object of depriving British Indians of these privileges proposed to substitute "All persons other than African Natives or Indian or Chinese cooly immigrants" for the expression "persons other than Natives" in the above Act. The proposal was accepted with some hesitation by the then Secretary of State for the Colonies, Lord Derby and the Volksraad was permitted to legislate on the lines suggested. The Volksraad thereupon misinterpreted the tenour of Lord Derby's order and passed a law (Law No. 3 of 1885) according to which Indians were prevented from acquiring citizenship in the Republic or owning landed property. Those who settled in the Republic were required to register themselves by paying £ 25 within eight days of their arrival in the Colony and the Government reserved to themselves the right of assigning to Indians special streets, wards and locations for their habitation. The new law was held by the Secretary of State to be in contravention of Article 14 of the Convention and after an elaborate correspondence between the Secretary of State and the High Commissioner, the Volksraad amended the law by permitting Indians to buy property in wards or streets, by reducing the fine of £ 25 to £ 3 and by stipulating that in confining Indians to "locations," the Volksraad was guided solely by sanitary considerations. The Government of the Transvaal next attempted to confine Indians to 'locations' not only for purposes of habitation but also for trade. The Indians in the Transvaal memorialised the Secretary of State: and the British and the Transvaal Governments referred the matter for arbitration to Mr. Melins de Villiers, Chief Justice of the Orange Free State. Mr. Villiers decided "that the South African Republic is bound

and entitled in its treatment of Indians and other Asiatic traders being British subjects, to give full force and effect to the provisions of Law No. 3 of 1885 enacted and in the year 1886, amended by the Volksraad of the South African Republic, subject (in case of objection having been raised by or on behalf of any such persons to any such treatment as not being in accordance with the provisions of the said law as amended) to sole and exclusive interpretation in ordinary course by the tribunal of the South African Republic." This decision by no means improved the position of Indians in the Republic, and representations were again made to the Secretary of State for the Colonies against the injustice of leaving their fate in the hands of local judges in the Transvaal. The memorials of Indians did not produce the desired result, but Mr. Chamberlain, the Secretary of State said in a despatch to the High Commissioner that "whilst desirous loyally to abide by the award and to allow it to close the legal and international questions in dispute between the two Governments, I reserve to myself the liberty later on, to make friendly representations to the South African Republic as to these traders and possibly to invite that Government to consider whether when once its legal position has been made good, it would not be wise to review the situation from a new point of view and decide whether it would not be better in the interests of its own burghers to treat the Indians more generously and to free itself from even the appearance of countenancing a trade jealousy, which I have some reasons to believe does not emanate from the governing classes in the Republic." The legal position of the Transvaal Government has been settled. A test case was brought before the High Court of the Transvaal and their judicial tribunal has ordered the Indians to 'locations' and since then the order has been enforced. But no friendly 'representation' has gone forth from Mr. Chamberlain to treat the Indians "more generously."

There are several other disabilities imposed on Indians in the Transvaal. They are prohibited from travelling in first and second class railway carriages intended for the white population. Every Indian is required to buy a travelling pass worth a shilling when he travels. In 1885, a treaty was entered into between Her Majesty's Government and the Transvaal Government exempting British subjects from compulsory military service, but the Volks raad has interpreted this treaty to apply only to 'whites' and not colored British subjects. As in Zululand, the gold mining laws of the Transvaal make it penal for Indians to be found in possession of native gold: as in Natal, no Indian in the Transvaal can stir out of his home after 9 P. M., without a pass; and as in Cape Colony, there are instructions issued to the Police in Pretoria to keep Indians out of footpaths.

The laws of the Orange Free State which is an independent Dutch

Republic make it almost impossible for Indians to reside in that colony. The Law of 1890, Chap XXXIII. which is entitled the "Law to prevent the inrush of Asiatic coloured persons" prevents any Indian from remaining in the colony for more than two months unless he obtains the special permission of the President. The President however cannot consider the application before the lapse of a month after the application. Indians are also forbidden from holding any fixed property or carrying on any mercantile or farming business: and if these conditions are violated, the delinquents are liable to a fine of £25 or imprisonment for three months. In addition to these disabilities, Indians are subject to an annual poll-tax of £10. In 1890 there were three Indian stores in the Republic but they were closed after a year's notice to the proprietors to clear out without any compensation whatever. The liquidated assets of the stores amounted to something like £ 9,000. The injured Indians appealed to the British Government for protection, but they appealed in vain. Consequent on these stringent regulations, the only Indians in the colony are employed as general servants.

In striking contrast to the treatment accorded to Her Majesty's Indian subjects resident in these colonies is the respect shown to them in Delagoa Bay and other Portuguese territories in South Africa. In Delagoa Bay Indians are subject to no disabilities of any kind, and they are consequently owners of nearly one half of the landed property in the principal streets. Indians also enjoy absolute freedom as traders and some are even in the service of Government. It is also stated that the respect of the Portuguese authorities for Indians is so great that they permit Indians to travel second class even in cases they have purchased third class tickets if it is found that they cannot afford to buy tickets of a higher class.

It is indeed extraordinary that the rights and privileges an Indian exercises in his own country and even in foreign countries, he should forfeit the moment he places his foot in any of the British Colonies in South Africa, nay, that he should be treated more courteously and respectfully in the colonies of other European nations adjacent to the British Colonies. If I may be pardoned for quoting from a speech on the subject delivered by me at the last Indian National Congress at Calcutta:—"How strange and singular is our position! In India we are permitted to become members of the Imperial Legislative Council. In England even the doors of that august assembly, the House of Commons, are open to us. But in South Africa we are not permitted to travel without a pass: we are not allowed to walk about in the night: we are consigned to locations: we are denied admission to first and second classes on railways: we are driven out of tramcars: we are pushed off footpaths: we are kept out of hotels: we are refused the benefits

of the public baths: we are spat at, we are hissed at, we are cursed, we are hated: we are abused: and we are subjected to a variety of other indignities which no human being can patiently endure."

This state of things indeed requires some explanation. The colonists maintain that the restrictions are necessary in the interests of sanitation. It is said that the habits of Indians are insanitary, that they are dirty and uncleanly, and that they are untruthful and immoral. These charges, however, have been found to be not sustainable. Several European doctors have pronounced Indians to be as cleanly as their white neighbours, and their morals are not worse than the morals of corresponding classes anywhere in Europe. The real reason of all this class hatred which has led to invidious class legislation is that the Indians are thrifty and economic in their style of living, patient and persevering, and as traders they run European merchants very close. It will be observed that it is in those of the British Colonies in which Indians compete closely in the pursuit of different professions with the European settlers and are numerically strong that the ill-treatment of Indians is at its worst. In cape Colony the Indian population is only about 10,000 whereas the whites number 400,000; but in Natal, the Indian population is even slightly more than the population of the white settlers,—51,000 as against 50,000—and the disabilities imposed in this colony are far more severe than those in the Cape Colony. The Rt. Hon'ble Joseph Chamberlain hit the right nail on the head when he suggested in his despatch to the High Commissioner of South Africa on the Transvaal Republic that in the interests of "its own burghers" the Republic ought to "free itself from even the appearance of countenancing a trade jealousy" against a class of people whom he described as "peaceful, law abiding" "meritorious," and possessing "undoubted industry and intelligence" and "indomitable perseverance." What he said of the Transvaal is true of all the South African colonies.

Attempts are often made by well-meaning Englishmen to make British Indians believe that they are not merely natives of India but Imperial subjects or units that compose the population which inhabit the proud British Empire over which the sun never sets: but how can Indians share this belief or be proud of the fact that they are subjects of a common Empire when the moment they step into any of the British Colonies in South Africa, the charm of their existence as British subjects is lost by the deprivation of their status as British subjects? So far as words go, Her Majesty the Queen and her ministers have conferred the greatest blessing on the people of India. In her memorable Proclamation of 1858, Her Majesty the Queen said:—"We hold ourselves bound to the natives of our Indian territories by

the same obligations of duty which bind us to all our other subjects ; and those obligations, by the blessing of Almighty God, we shall faithfully and conscientiously fulfil." Lord Ripon while Viceroy of India declared that it was the "desire of Her Majesty's Government that the Queen's Indian subjects should be treated on a footing of equality with all Her Majesty's subjects." Mr. Joseph Chamberlain, while approached by an Indian deputation on the subject of the ill-treatment of Indians in South Africa said "we all desire that all British subjects should be treated alike and should have equal rights and privileges." None can question the sincerity of Her Majesty's declaration or the declaration of any of her ministers : but the fact remains that to-day, in this age of enlightenment and progress, of tolerance and freedom, in all Her Majesty's colonies in South Africa, self-governing or belonging to the crown, and in other colonies over which Her Majesty holds partial sway or exercises some shadow of authority, her beloved Indian subjects who in their own country are competent to try Englishmen and in the British Isles are allowed to co-operate with Englishmen in the task of legislating for the people, are treated like an inferior order of beings fit only to be hewers of wood and drawers of water to the haughty white population that domineer over the land !

RAILWAYS IN INDIA.

G. SUBRAMANIA IYER Esq., B. A.

(*Late Editor of " The Hindu".*)

Lord Elgin has faithfully pursued the policy of breathless rapidity in the extension of Railway communication in India, and during the five years of his administration 4,500 miles of Railway have been added at a cost of nearly 400 millions of rupees. As in so many other matters, in the matter of Railway extension also, the retiring Viceroy easily fell in with the prevailing view, which is that " nothing could tend to promote prosperity in India more than a large Railway expenditure." This was Sir Henry Fowler's view, as it is that of Lord George Hamilton. In fact, the philanthropy of England combines with that of monied interest to press the fad of unlimited expenditure in the construction of Railways as the *panacea* for all the economic evils of India. Good and charitable persons, grieved at the chronic poverty of their Indian fellow-creatures and at the terrible famine that periodically devastates the land, sweeping away thousands, besides depriving millions of their health and vital energies, advocate the extension of Railways. Then, there are investors, company promoters, bankers, iron masters, coal owners, railway engineers and directors, and above all, retired Anglo-Indian officials, looking out for a decent addition to their pension, who are all interested in pushing forward the construction of Railways in India. The European merchants who command the whole of India's foreign trade and whose business is no longer confined to the principal towns on the coast but penetrates the villages also, are similarly interested in extending the net work of Railways, covering the surface of the country. The pressure of the combined influence of philanthropy and interest is too strong for British statesmen to resist, and Lord Curzon, dominated as he is by an unbounded admiration for the civilising influence of British resources has not, it is evident, remained beyond the reach of this pressure. He will continue the policy of his predecessor and hopes, before his term of office in India expires, to be able to add 5,000 miles more of fresh Railways to the 23,000 already in operation.

The object of this paper is not to deprecate all further extension of Railways, but only to plead for greater moderation in that respect and for a policy by which Railways can be made in India the unmixed blessing that they are

in other countries. Nobody can deny that Railways have done immense good. In the great work of distributing the food stock of the country, they have done immense service. They have, in some localities, stimulated production by creating fresh markets. As a factor in the progress of people in general civilization their service has been invaluable, and above all, in times of famine, they enable Government to carry on relief operations on a gigantic scale with great success, and private trade to carry food to the affected tracts from the more prosperous tracts of the country. But making full allowance for these considerations, there is room for difference of opinion, regarding the wisdom of the policy pursued in recent years in spending millions of borrowed money, year after year, without the least regard for the financial difficulties of the State and the economical condition of the country. Railways are not the only means of ameliorating the condition of the people. They cannot produce wealth, but can only help in its distribution. On the other hand, works of irrigation enable the ryot to grow two bushels of corn where he grew only one ; and a well-planned system of industrial and scientific education will directly tend to an economic upheaval, replacing custom by competition, hereditary training by originality, and poverty by affluence. The most zealous friends of British Indian Government cannot say that this latter object receives that amount of attention which its importance deserves ; while in regard to irrigation, the policy of Government is half-hearted and by no means as liberal as it is in regard to Railways. Now that all the Railways required for the protection of the people against famine according to the recommendation of the Famine Commission have been completed, there is no longer the same urgent necessity for the expenditure of enormous borrowed sums on the construction of new Railways, more or less commercial in their nature.

According to the Report of the Parliamentary Committee in 1881, the total amount to be borrowed for Railway construction every year was limited to £2,500,000, independently of any sums provided by revenues or by companies. Another committee in 1884 raised the limit to £2,950,000. This latter limit too was soon exceeded on account of frontier Railways, and in particular years there were also some exceptional charges. Since 1896, however, the average annual expenditure has come up to nearly 10 crores of rupees. The policy of previous years was considered not bold enough, and accordingly in 1896, Lord Elgin announced this departure, in exceedingly confident and glowing terms. His Excellency said :—

"The development of the country by the construction of railways has for long been the recognised policy of the Government of India, and I need support it by no detailed argument. The fact is that it is the method by which we can materially improve the condition of the vast population dependent upon agriculture most surely and most steadily, and I am the last

person to deny the contention of the honourable Member from the Central Provinces that there is much in the condition of the agricultural population that calls for the careful attention of the Government. Even irrigation works, all important as they are in certain localities, can scarcely claim such far-reaching results as railways: at all events, unless irrigation and railway works proceed simultaneously.

"I need scarcely point out that the improvement in the condition of the people which I have claimed for railways has a special bearing on the discussion of to-day. I believe that, if the lines we have constructed for military purposes and protection against famine are kept separate, a very sufficient return is realised on the capital we have expended on Railways. But, in truth, their value is far grater indirectly, from the growth and stability of the land-revenue on which Indian finance depends so much, and which in its turn depends largely on increased facilities of communication.

"But, while there has never been much doubt about the policy, there has been considerable debate as to the best means of carrying it out. At first the construction of railways was generally entrusted to companies under some form of guarantee; then came a period when State agency alone was employed. Since 1880 the pendulum has swung now to one side, now to another: and the problem has been how best to utilise the resources of the State on the one hand, and the funds which private enterprise offers on the other.

"At the commencement of 1895-96, *i.e.*, on the 1st April 1895, the total length of railways open for traffic was 18,863 miles, and the mileage under construction, or sanctioned for commencement on the same date, was 2,217 miles. During 1895-96, *i.e.*, from 1st April 1895 to the present time, the commencement of 2,384 miles of new railway was authorised, and 1,009 miles were opened to traffic.

"Thus the total length of open line at the present moment is 19,873 miles, and the mileage now under construction, or sanctioned for commencement, is 3,564 miles.

"Adding together the amount of construction completed during the current year, and that in hand at the end of it, we have 4,573 miles, or an addition of one-fourth to the existing railways of India. This length of line exceeds the total length constructed in the United Kingdom in the last 20 years: or, to put it another way, is more than double the entire mileage of what is sometimes called the premier railway in England, the London and North Western Railway Company, while there are only half a-dozen railway companies in the United Kingdom whose mileage exceeds that which we opened as new lines in India in the single year 1895-96.

"I think that honourable Members will be of opinion that this is a sufficiently extended programme. That part of it which still remains to be completed represents an expenditure of something like 35 crores. The Financial Statement shows that we are preparing to undertake not much less than a third of it during the year 1896-97, including the amounts which are to be provided by companies and do not pass through the Government accounts.

"I have shown that our programme is a full peogramme, and that it covers a great deal of ground. I wish now to impress upon you that all this lays upon the Government one duty above others for the present, *i.e.*, to resist temptation. It is very tempting to be asked to embark in large schemes of great works. But, if I am right in saying that the State is concerned in some way or other in every railway enterprise in India, it is undoubtedly incumbent on us not only to push forward railway construction at a favourable time such as this, but to do so at a rate that is not excessive, but can be steadily maintained: to be bold indeed but not to be rash. With this object it is most desirable that the Government should themselves determine in the case of the larger schemes what new railways are required, and when they ought to be undertaken. It is only by so doing that a programme can be formed, can be adhered to, and can be carried out with regularity and efficiency. For the present, it

will be clear to every one that, so far as large schemes are concerned, our hands are full and our ambitions must be humble.

"But there is another branch of railway construction which is at this moment even more important than the prosecution of large schemes, and that is, the construction of those shorter lines which spread out from the great systems and, by gathering together the produce of the country, extend the beneficial influence of these systems over a far wider area. There is but one opinion of the necessity that exists for these lines in all directions if we are to secure the development of the country of which I spoke at the beginning. I hope that, though our hands are full, it will still be possible to proceed with this work. It is a work which is specially suited for the employment of private enterprise, and I have told you the encouragement we are prepared to offer. It is a work which can also be profitably undertaken by the great main lines themselves, and we are anxious to see them engaged in it. It is a work of which the several items may seem unimportant, yet which is the most potent instrument we possess, not only to consolidate and render profitable the great railway system of India, in which so much of its wealth is invested, but to make it an all-powerful agent in the promotion of the material and social advancement and political tranquillity of the people."

Lord Elgin's figures had to be slightly altered subsequently. The Secretary of State gave in the year 1896 his formal approval to a programme of Railway construction, either direct by Government, or by companies acting under the guarantees of Government, which covered about Rs. 28,000,000 of Railway expenditure, to be spread over three years, of which 1896–97 was the first. Of these 28 crores, Government was to raise in India as much money as it thought it could conveniently borrow, and the rest was to be raised in England, either directly by the Secretary of State or by Companies acting under agreements with him. But this amount, large as it was, did not include the transactions of certain companies whose relations with Government did not involve a direct guarantee by the latter and which worked under special terms (like the Bengal and North Western Railway), or under what are known as Branch-line terms. Nor did it include certain small transactions on provincial account which were charged to Revenue. Though the amount of 28 crores was subsequently raised to $29\frac{2}{3}$ crores, the actual expenditure exceeded this amount, as follows :—

	Revised 1896–97.	Revised 1897-98.	Revised 1898-99.
On Government account	Rs. 11,228,000	8,414,400	10,836,900*

Total for 3 years Rs. 30,479,300.

* It remains to be seen whether this allotment was fully worked up, or what modification is necessary in the accounts.

This colossal programme created misgivings in the public mind, and the wisdom of the policy of the Government of India was questioned in many quarters. The policy was designed, according to Lord Elgin, to be bold but stop short of rashness, but in the opinion of many, it was rash,

not merely bold. The Honorable R. M. Sayani pointed out in the Viceroy's Council :—

The Government and the Companies thus spent or undertook liabilities to the extent of 91 million pounds and 55 crores of rupees, and, turning the pounds into rupees at 16 pence, a total liability of more than 200 crores of rupees was incurred being 10 crores per year. The financial result of all this expenditure is admitted to be that whereas 20 years ago the charge on the revenue was 1½ crores, this charge is now 2 crores. The Honourable the Financial Member, while admitting that there is this apparent loss, reconciles himself to it by saying that owing to the fall of the rupee, it is really a gain of 50 lakhs a year. This may or may not be the case, but it is plain that financially, so far from this alleged reproductive expenditure yielding a profit, the returns from the works have to be supplemented by two crores of rupees a year out of revenue to satisfy interest. Turning to the detailed list of 50 railway works, it appears that as many as 38 works show loss, and only 8 works show gain, in 1896-97. Under these circumstances, it may fairly be asked whether the policy of pushing on railways by an annual expenditure exceeding 10 crores under our existing circumstances does not require consideration. While railways absorb so large a measure of Government attention, irrigation canals, which are far more protective against famine, are allowed only three-quarters of a crore of rupees or about *one thirteenth of the amount spent* on railways each year. Railways as such can only distribute produce, and they do not help the soil in raising more produce in times of drought. During the last famine, irrigation works brought in 50 lakhs of additional revenue, while the railway receipts fell short of the estimated amounts by nearly a crore and a half. These considerations make a modification in our present policy in regard to the respective claims of railways and irrigation canals a matter of urgent necessity.

Of course the official view is different. Speaking in the Supreme Legislative Council in 1896, Sir James Westland vindicated the policy of vigorous extension, Lord Elgin's new departure, as follows :—

" Taking the whole of them (Railway transactions), the charge to the Government is only two crores of rupees. I would ask simply as a question of policy, whether the possession of these twenty thousand miles of Railways is not worth, to the people of India, two crores of rupees. There is not a soul in the room who would not admit that India would be better for these Railways, even if the people had to pay ten crores a year instead of two. With reference to these two crores of rupees, I have also to state that the loss which we have to bear mostly arises upon Railway construction on the guaranteed system. The loss of a few years ago was only 70 lakhs of rupees. It has since amounted to two crores [the amount in 1897 was 2¾ crores]—mainly because we have to bear a heavy loss of exchange upon the sterling debt connected with the other Railways. We would have to bear this loss even if we were not constructing any Railways during the last ten or twenty years. The later construction and expansion of Railways have therefore, on the whole, a financial gain."

The Hon'ble Mr. Trevor, the Public Works Member of Government, was even more enthusiastic while speaking in the same place

in 1897: "While I am not prepared to assert", he said, "that we can as yet point to a clear and indisputable return on our capital as shown by the Railway Revenue account, I should like to insist on this, that the Railway Revenue account shows every rupee by which the direct receipts from Railway traffic fall short of the burden which our Railway proprietorship and responsibilities impose on the Indian Exchequer, whether in the shape of interest or capital raised either in England or in India, loss by exchange, or in any other way. What it does not show is the share contributed by the expansion of Railway communication to the general stability of our financial position. It is impossible to estimate the value of that share in figures. But apart from the benefit to the administration and the promotion (to quote once more your lordship's words) of material and social advancement and political tranquility of the people, apart from the expansion of trade, and its effects in counteracting the burdens imposed on us by the fall in exchange, I think I may assert without fear of contradiction, that there is hardly any important item of growing revenue which would have expanded if our Railway construction had stood still. I shall, I hope, command the assent of my hearers when I say that even $2\frac{3}{4}$ crores is a small price to pay for all the advantages obtained (my honorable colleague said last year that they would be cheap at 10 crores), and that it would be short-sighted and unwise for the Government of India to allow themselves to be deterred by temporary difficulties from prosecuting their policy of steady and well-considered progress so long as those difficulties can be overcome (and so long as the funds required can be raised on reasonable terms and without resort to additional taxation."

Before proceeding further I shall examine the foundation of this extreme optimism. Sir James Westland omits an important item of loss in the current expenditure on construction. As the late Mr Stephen Jacob pointed out before the Welby Commission, a large portion of the capital expenditure on which interest is charged, is not producing any revenue at all. The accounts for the nine years ending 1894-95 of capital expenditure on lines under construction, on surveyed, and unopened lines, show that the accumulated balance on such lines during this period was Rx. 11,000,000 on which interest is charged but which pays no revenue at all. I am not in possession of the figures for subsequent years, but the accumulation may be supposed to be continuing and involving a loss of at least fifty lakhs of rupees a year. Besides, the Finance Minister's statement that the loss to the State from Railways is mainly due to the debt connected with the older Railways, is misleading, as a reference to the latest administration report (1896-97) shows that it is not the old guaranteed lines alone that contribute to this

loss, but the other later lines too have a large share in it.

The following shows the loss to the state from Railway outlay from 1858—9 to 1896—97 (revised estimate).

	Rx.
By Guaranteed Railways excluding East Indian, Eastern Bengal, Sindh, Punjab and South Indian Railways (from 1872—73)	33206301
By state lines worked by the state	23012812
By state lines leased by and worked by companies excluding East Indian Railway	7361811
Total loss ...	63580924
Deduct gain from East Indian Railway (from 1872—73)	14125267
Total net loss ...	49455657
Add other charges ...	6118607
Total loss the to state ...	55574214

Nor is it true practically to say that but for the Railways the revenues of the Government would not have been as elastic as they are. For, where is this elasticity that is attributed to the Railways? Indian officials generally have two faces to their shield. Lord Elgin and the Honorable Mr. Trevor speak of the elasticity of the revenues, more especially of the land revenue. But the accredited representatives of Government have often contradicted this and complained of little or no elasticity in them. For instance Mr. J. E. O'Conor, speaking before the Currency Committee, said, "As regards the elasticity of the revenue, I prepared three or four years ago for the Statistical Atlas of India, a diagram showing the way in which, the proceeds of taxation have increased under the main heads: land revenue, salt, opium, excise, stamps, provincial rates, customs, assessed taxes (that is practically the income tax), and registration. If you look at that diagram you will see the lines run almost level; there has been little increase. There has been a certain amount of elasticity, but it is nothing as compared with what it is in England." If there has been elasticity, why has it happened that since 1882, when the last remissions of taxation were made, the Government has not only not been able to afford any relief to the taxpayers but has been busily engaged in imposing fresh taxation? As for land revenue, the annual increase is so little as 1·26 per cent. which however, it is notorious, is not due to its natural elasticity, but to continual enhancement by a revision of settlement and to fresh land

brought under cultivation. "The growth and elasticity of the land revenue, of which Lord Elgin spoke as the effect of railway extension, exist only in official imagination.

Officials and European merchants hold as an immutable truth that as Railways increase, trade expands. It appears it has become proverbial among them that "Railways make trade." Do they make trade? What are the figures! The quantity of goods carried by rail and river from one province to another, excluding goods carried to the ports is as follows :—

1891–92 ...	... 131,911,000	Maunds.
1892–93 ...	... 130,451,000	
1893–94 ...	... 136,493,000	
1894–95 ...	... 159,781,000	
1895–96 ...	... 157,559,700	
1896–97 ...	... 167,065,640	

From the above figures, if we exclude the results of the stimulus which famine and scarcity give to the transport of food from one province to another, there is not apparent very considerable increase in internal trade.

Again, the weight of merchandise carried to the ports in the same period was :—

1891–92 ...	... 184,405,000	Maunds.
1892–93 ...	... 165,781,000	
1893–94 ...	... 174,672,000	
1894–95 ...	... 173,961,000	
1895–96 ...	... 185,199,000	
1896–97 ...	... 165,105,000	

On account of the state of the currency and famine, there has been a decline in the weight of merchandise carried to the ports. But the whole of this portion of our internal trade referred to above are in the hands of Europeans to whom every mile of Railway connecting the producing areas with the chief markets in the country brings an addition to their business and profit. But trade is merely a change of articles from hand to hand and implies no addition to the wealth of the country.

The present policy of breathless expansion of the Railway system with money borrowed in England operates in its results as a many-sided evil. It adds yearly to our sterling obligations and the necessity of meeting these obligations, combining with the cupidity of foreign merchants, stimulates the export trade of India by a rapid increase of Railway communication. And low exchange has tended to the same result. In fact, low exchange, increased sterling obligations and the enormous annual expenditure on the construction of Railways constitute a three faced evil which have had a most deplorable effect on the food stock of the country. According to Anglo-Indian

merchants big exports are what India wants. One of these stated before the Currency Committee that the "principal object to bear in mind is to increase the prosperity of India by developing and opening up this vast empire, thereby increasing her capacity for export." But with all the speed in Railway construction in recent years and with all the consequent prosperity of export trade, the condition of the ryots has not been marked by any particular signs of prosperity. On the other hand, official statistics point to a dangerous deterioration. In his preliminary narrative of the late famine, Mr. Holderness, after making a careful calculation of the actual produce of food and the requirements of the population at the present time, on the basis of the figures of the Famine Commission in 1880, concludes that the surplus food over and above the amount required for the consumption of the people is at present less by 2,500,000 tons than it was in 1880. The frightful significance of this deficiency will be apparent when it is understood that $2\frac{1}{2}$ millions of tons of food will feed nearly a crore of people. Within the last fifteen years the extent of land cultivated with non-food crops has increased 81·40 per cent; whereas the increase in regard to food crops is only 12 per cent. The larger acreage of non-food crops is to be attributed to the increase in our sterling liabilities which demand increased exports of produce. It is also to be attributed to low exchange which has made foreign markets exceptionally attractive for Indian produce like jute, cotton, tea, coffee &c. The Indian peasants are thus under a powerful inducement to cultivate these crops in perference to food crops, and the situation has been complicated, and the mischief has been accentuated, by the formation of powerful combinations of foreign capitalists and speculators for export. (R. D. Mehta in the Calcatta *Statesman*). Messrs Ralli Brothers are a well known representative of this combination. These do not deal directly with the cultivator, but make large contracts with small traders for "delivery ahead", and these small traders advance money to the cultivators, who, being thus indebted, hand over their grain, at prices previously fixed, to the small dealers. The enormous quantities of wheat thus sold in the last season to this firm who filled almost every wagon in the railway train and every goodshed in the stations with their wheat intended for export, were a phenomenon marked with regret by every well-wisher of the Indian ryot.

If India were a self-governing country without the serious evil of foreign domination, not only in the public service, but in the management of railways and every other large enterprise, perhaps the contention that most countries in the world, engaged in a vigorous prosecution of Railway construction, borrow the required capital from England, and that this fact is not looked upon as a source of economic evil, would be sound. It is true that Australia, China, Japan, and other countries obtain their capital for

this purpose from foreign markets and they pay large amounts of interest to their foreign creditors. Still, it cannot be denied that this foreign payment is an evil in these countries as well as in India ; at all events they would avoid it, if they could. But these countries enjoying the blessings of self-government and not being liable to foreign drain by other channels, the evil is almost imperceptible. But what is the case in regard to India? India has her wealth drained into foreign countries to the extent of 30 millions sterling every year, and her people are exceedingly poor with a heavy and oppressive burden of taxation to bear ; and this great fact distinguishes India from all other countries in the world, and introduces in the consideration of her political and economic questions a point of view which does not arise in self-governing countries like Australia and China. Amidst this enormous drain which, as Lord Salisbury observed, is bleeding India to exhaustion, the payment of nearly three millions every year as interest on her railway expenditure is not a small matter. It would be different if India had no drain of her money in other ways, and if she had only to pay the interest on foreign capital raised for this purpose.

And then there is another difference between India and other countries in this respect. In Australia, for instance, the railways are not administered by a large number of foreigners in receipt of handsome salaries. In India, on the other hand, nearly two thousand six hundred Europeans employed in the management of railways already constructed are at present in receipt of salaries aggregating every year to the large amount of nearly eight hundred thousand pounds. These eight hundred-thousand pounds include only the salaries of Europeans holding higher appointments. There are in almost every railway a host of young men employed to do ministerial work. It should be remembered that every European employed in this manner not only takes away the bread from the mouth of an Indian who would otherwise take his place, but also takes away the opportunity of a training in public administrative work which the Indians would otherwise have. Thus, in addition to the enormous foreign drain of India's wealth as the result of her foreign domination, the army of Europeans employed in the administration of the railways, and the loss of opportunities for administrative training that I have referred to, constitute the radical difference between India and other countries in respect of the construction of railways, and this difference it is extremely difficult to make officials comprehend. The Commissioners probably think that with all these evils which must be admitted, there are advantages which more than compensate for them and which justify the policy of extending this means of communication as rapidly as possible. But I have endeavoured to point

out that these compensating advantages are exaggerated and in many respects imaginary.

Much stress is laid on the fact that the Railways would be of invaluable service in times of famine by bringing into the affected areas food stuff not merely from the unaffected areas of India itself, but from all parts of the world. At first sight there appears to be a good deal of truth in this. But, as a fact, have the 23,000 miles of railway that now traverse the country prevented a famine? Since the great famine of 1878, more than 10,000 miles have been constructed, and who would deny that the present famine has proved disastrous to the people?

I do not for a moment deny that Railways have been highly useful in transporting food from one part of the country to another, and thereby have made food to some extent available in the afflicted areas. But Railways do not transport food for nothing. The process of transportation costs money, and at the place where grain is brought for consumption, it can be sold only at prices higher than those of normal years. The theory that grains can be imported into India from foreign countries and that in times of scarcity India would indent on other parts of the world, has not been found to hold good in the recent famine. The much-talked-of relief from America and Russia did not come, for the very obvious and sufficient reason that private enterprise could not undertake the transportation without profit, and it would not pay to bring wheat all the way down from America or Russia to India. The fact is the Indian famine is as much of money as of grain; perhaps it is becoming more and more the former than the latter. The Indian people are becoming more and more impoverished, and even when the grain is available, there must be money to buy it with, which money is not forthcoming. It appears to me therefore that the theory that Railways are the panacea of all the economic evils of India is a fallacy.

It is urged by the exponents of official opinion that Railways tend to raise the prices of agricultural produce and thereby benefit the cultivators. I doubt whether the so-called rise in the prices is the result of an increase, in the prosperity of the people. The official figures representing the rise in prices are misleading, because they include prices in years of drought and abnormal seasons and in places where large numbers of people more or less temporarily congregate on account of large public works executed by Government. If allowance were made for these as well as for the prices in large cities where they must be higher than elsewhere, I am not sure that in the villages any considerable rise in the prices of grain can be proved. Still granting that there has been a genuine rise in the prices, let us consider whether it is of any real good to the cultivator. So far as his payment to

the Government goes, he would be no doubt a gainer. For, while the assessment is unchanged for a period of years, he could pay it, if the prices had risen, by disposing of a smaller quantity of his produce. But even here, there is a lurking fallacy. The arrangements for the payment of the demand by Government are such that the rayat is forced to dispose of his produce at a time of the year when the produce sells cheapest. The time for the payment is fixed about the harvest time to enable the rayat to satisfy the demand easily. But this very fact brings an enormous quantity of the produce to the market in a forced manner, and the excessive and unnatural glut in the market tends to the lowering of prices. The middleman takes advantage of the rayat's difficulty, and buys up the available grain and stores it in order that he may sell it when the prices are most dear. In many instances, the rayat sells off most of the grain he has, and having consumed in a few months what little remained, he buys his food when it is dear. Apart from this payment of the Government demand, the rise in prices does not at all help the rayats. The majority of the landholders paying tax to Government in all parts of the country, except where the system of permanent settlement prevails, are exceedingly poor, holding a property of five acres or so. In the Presidency of Madras two-thirds of these hold such petty properties that they pay no more than ten rupees a year to the Government, an amount which, according to the theory of the settlement, represents one-half of the landholders' net produce. In other words, two-thirds of the landholders of Southern India derive from their land an income of no more than ten rupees after paying the Government's demand. Surely, such poor people cannot benefit much from increased prices. What is left after the payment of the Government's demand is mostly taken by the rayat's creditors, so that his actual food, as well as other articles of consumption, such as the condiments, fuel, clothes, etc., he has to buy in the market. Thus, it will be seen, the rayat is not a gainer from the so-called increase in prices ; on the other hand the real gainer is the middleman.

There is also another point of view from which the extension of Railways is not an unmixed blessing in India. Railways necessarily tend to upset the old indigenous industrial system. India is not a new country where the people are a newly settled community with a civilzation yet to grow, with no ancient industries and arts to boast of. Here again the officials betray their inability to realise the peculiar conditions of India and could not understand that the institutions and improvements which are an unmixed blessing in countries where they have spontaneously grown up in the gradual evolution from a previous state of things, or in countries where society is a *tabula rasa*, as it were, on which any superstructure can be raised without any

destructive effect, may not be the same in a country like India where a social system has grown up during ages when Railways as well as most appliances of the modern civilisation of the West were unknown. As a fact, wherever the Railway penetrates in India, it carries destruction into the indigenous industries which have given the means of sustenance to the people and to which they have become accustomed during centuries In no instance has this destructive effect of Railways been proved to produce more lamentable results than in the weaving industry of India.

What applies to the weaving industry applies to all indigenous industries. In fact every machine-made article imported from Europe and carried into the Indian village with the help of Railways drives a nail in the coffin of a native industry, and in this manner the Railways have to answer for a good deal of the poverty which makes the lot of the Indian poor so miserable. It may be said that the evil is inevitable and India is only going through the same experience that other countries went through in the period of transition when machinery replaced manual labour. This is true no doubt. But there is no particular reason why this inevitable evil should be aggravated and the work of the people's destruction made quicker and more complete by taxing the people themselves. Cannot the destructive process be made slower and more gradual so that the people may be given time to recover themselves?

The question of Railway extension in India raises the other important question—where the required money should be borrowed, in London or at home. I have already referred to one weighty consideration in favour of the latter course. There are other reasons to which it is necessary to refer here. The result of borrowing in London has not been at all encouraging during the last quarter of a century. Though the rates of interest have been reduced, still the rupee has so fallen in value that the saving from reduced rates of interest has been more than counterbalanced by the increase in the cost of exchange. The amount of interest on the sterling loans has grown during the last eighteen years from $2\frac{1}{2}$ millions to nearly $3\frac{3}{4}$ millions. In 1896 the Government resolved to borrow nearly 30 crores of rupees more for the construction of Railways. Of these 30 crores, about ten are to be borrowed in India, the rest being raised in London; and this will add another half a million sterling to the amount of interest. When the 20 crores are raised in London, the total amount of sterling loan will be 125 millions, roughly speaking. If the Government of India were to make up its mind to repay this whole loan, it would have to find nearly $17\frac{1}{2}$ rupees for every pound sterling, that is to say, nearly 2,200 crores of rupees. But this impossible task the Government has no intention of trying. No provision

is made in the Indian Budget for a sinking fund every year for the repayment of the foreign loan. So that the four millions paid as interest will be a perpetual yearly charge on the revenues of India. Nobody can maintain that such an unceasing drain is desirable. On the other hand, if all further growth of this charge can be stopped and all loans were raised in India, limiting the annual amount to what the Indian money market can safely supply, not only will the increasing drain be arrested, but the Indian capitalists will be benefited in proportion. The Government has estimated that about 5 crores of rupees can be annually borrowed in India; and to be on the safe side, and in order that the capital available for local industry and trade may not be encroached upon, we may put this figure at 3 crores. If to this amount a crore from the current revenue of the Government were added, it would give 4 crores every year for the extension of railway communication; and with this amount, whatever may be the consequence, the Government should rest content. During recent years Indian borrowing at home has been beneficial. The price of Rupee Paper has been steadily rising, and Government has been able to borrow at lower and lower rates. The 4 per cent. Rupee Paper was converted first into $3\frac{1}{2}$ per cents. and subsequently to 3 per cents. Even if the Government has to pay a higher rate of interest in the Indian market than in the London market, it would be, for reasons already stated and for those which I shall briefly refer to below, more advantageous, on the whole, to borrow in the home market. Strangely, our financial authorities lose sight of the fact that the fall in the gold value of silver is exaggerated by the Secretary of State's offering for sale every year an increasing number of Bills in London. But the question should not be looked at from the point of view of Government's finance; it should be considered in respect of the results on the people of India. If the loans were raised in India instead of in London, the interest would be paid to people resident in India. Supposing ten crores of rupees were borrowed in India at 3 per cent., the interest paid to those that lent the money would be 30 lakhs a year, and along with all the benefits to the trade and industry and the education of the people which would result from the Railways built with the money thus borrowed, the 30 lakhs would remain in the country and fructify in the pockets of the people. Such a policy, steadily pursued by the Government, would be a great inducement to habits of economy and prudent investment among the people. If the 10 crores were not lent to Government, that money, or most of it, would have been spent in the households, in the making of ornaments, in marriage and other ceremonies, or in other more or less unproductive ways. But lent to the Government, it would yield an income of 30 lakhs a year, which would probably be spent in new productive investments.

PART II.

THE INDIAN NATIONAL CONGRESS

Presidential Addresses.

First Congress—Bombay—1885.

THE HON'BLE W. C. BONNERJI.

The President-elect, in rising to acknowledge the honour done him, said he might well be proud of being thus called on to preside over the first National Assembly ever yet convened in India. Looking round he saw the representatives of all the important centres of the Bombay Presidency, Karrachi, Ahmedabad, Surat, Poona, Bombay itself, and other less populous though still important towns; almost every district in the Madras Presidency was represented, as well as the towns of Madras, Salem, Coimbatore and others. Of Bengal, his friends and himself might to a certain extent be accepted as representatives, since although owing to a series of misfortunes, deaths, illnesses and the like, of which the meeting were already aware, Bengal was very inadequately represented so far as the members actually present were concerned, though as the delegated exponents of educated native thought in Bengal, they might claim a consideration to which their numerical strength would hardly entitle them. Then, there were the representatives of Lahore, Lucknow, Agra, Allahabad, Benares, each representing political Associations collectively of very widespread influence. Besides these representatives who would take an actual part in the proceedings, he rejoiced to see present, as it were as *amici curiæ*, several of the most distinguished native officials of this country, whose presence would materially enhance the weight and the dignity of the proceedings. It was not merely provinces that were represented, almost all the political Associations in the Empire were represented by one or more of the gentlemen present, while as regards the Press, the proprietors, editors or delegates of the *Mirror*, the *Hindu*, the *Indian Spectator*, the *Tribune*, and others showed, conclusively, the universality of the feelings which had culminated in the great and memorable gathering. Surely never had so important and comprehensive an assemblage occurred within historical times on the soil of India. He claimed for it an entirely representative character. It was true that, judged from the standard of the House of Commons, they were not representatives of the people of India in the sense the members of the House were representatives of the constituencies. But if community of sentiments, community of feelings, and community of wants enabled any one to speak on behalf of others, then assuredly they might justly claim to be the representatives of the people of India. It might be said that they were self-elected, but that was not so. The news that this Congress would be held had been known throughout the year in the different provinces of India, and they all knew that everywhere the news had been received with great satisfaction by the people at large, and though no formal elections had been held, the representatives had been selected by all the different associations and bodies, and he only wished

that all thus selected had been able to attend, instead of their having now to lament the absence of many valued coadjutors, whose attendence had been unhappily barred by various unfortunate circumstances.

And now it seemed a fitting occasion for answering a question that had continually been asked in the world outside during the past few weeks, viz, what the objects and aims of this great National Congress really were. He would not pretend to reply to this question exhaustively. The ensuing proceedings would, he believed, do this more effectually than any single speaker could hope to do; but he might say briefly, that the objects of the Congress could for the most part be classed under the following heads:—

(*a*) The promotion of personal intimacy and friendship amongst all the more earnest workers in our country's cause in the parts of the Empire.

(*b*) The eradication, by direct friendly personal intercourse, of all possible race, creed, or provincial prejudices amongst all lovers of our country, and the fuller development and consolidation of those sentiments of national unity that had their origin in their beloved Lord Ripon's ever memorable reign.

(*c*) The authoritative record after this has been carefully elicited by the fullest discussion of the matured opinions of the educated classes in India on some of the more important and pressing of the social questions of the day.

(*d*) The determination of the lines upon and methods by which during the next twelve months it is desirable for native politicians to labour in the public intersts.

Surely there was nothing in these objects to which any sensible and unprejudiced man could possibly take exception, and yet on more than one occasion remarks had been made by gentlemen, who should have been wiser, condemning the proposed Congress, as if it were a nest of conspirators and disloyalists. Let him say once for all, and in this he knew well after the long informal discussions that they had all had amongst themselves on the previous day, that he was only expressing the sentiments of every gentlemen present, that there were no more thoroughly loyal and consistent well-wishers of the British Government than were himself and the friends around him. In meeting to discuss in an orderly and peaceable manner questions of vital importance affecting their well being, they were following the only course by which the constitution of England enabled them to represent their views to the ruling authority. Much had been done by Great Britain for the benefit of India, and the whole country was truly grateful to her for it. She had given them order, she had given them railways, and above all she had given them the inestimable blessing of Western education. But a great deal still remained to be done. The more progress the people made in education and material prosperity, the greater would be the insight into political matters and the keener their desire for political advancement. He thought that

their desire to be governed according to the ideas of government prevalent in Europe was in no way incompatible with their thorough loyalty to the British Government. All that they desired was that the basis of the government should be widened and that the people should have their proper and legitimate share in it. The discussions that would take place in this Congress would, he believed, be as advantageous to the ruling authorities as he was sure it would be to the people at large.

Second Congress—Calcutta—1886.

THE HON. DADABHAI NAOROJI.

I need not tell you how sincerely thankful I am to you for placing me in this position of honour. I at first thought that I was to be elevated to this proud position as a return for what might be considered as a compliment paid by us to Bengal when Mr. Bonnerjee was elected President of the first Congress last year at Bombay. I can assure you however that that election was no mere compliment to Bengal, but arose out of the simple fact that we regarded Mr. Bonnerjee as a gentleman eminently qualified to take the place of President, and we installed him, in that position in all sincerity as the proper man in the proper place. I now see however, that this election of my humble self is not intended as a return of compliment, but that, as both proposer and seconder have said, you have been kind enough to select me because I am supposed to be really qualified to undertake the task. I hope it may prove so and that I may be found really worthy of all the kind things said of me; but whether this be so, or not, when such kind things are said by those who occupy such high positions amongst us, I must say I feel exceedingly proud and am very grateful to all for the honour thus done me. (*Loud cheering.*)

Your late Chairman has heartily welcomed all the delegates who come from different parts of India, and with the same heartiness I return to him, and all our Bengal friends on my own behalf and on that of all the delegates from other Provinces, the most sincere thanks for the cordial manner in which we have been received. From what has been done already, and from what is in store for us during our short stay here, I have no doubt we shall carry away with us many and most pleasant reminiscences of our visit to Calcutta. (*Cheers.*)

You will pardon me, and I beg your indulgence when I say that when I was asked only two days ago to become your President and to give an inaugural address,

it was with no small trepidation that I agreed to undertake the task; and I hope that you will extend to me all that indulgence which my shortcomings may need. (*Loud cheers.*)

The assemblage of such a Congress is *an event of the utmost importance in Indian history.* I ask whether in the most glorious days of Hindu rule, in the days of Rajahs like the great Vikram, you could imagine the possibility of a meeting of this kind, where even Hindus of all different provinces of the kingdom could have collected and spoken as one nation. Coming down to the later Empire of our friends, the Mahomedans, who probably ruled over a larger territory at one time than any Hindu monarch, would it have been, even in the days of the great Akbar himself, possible for a meeting like this to assemble composed of all classes and communities, all speaking one language, and all having uniform and high aspirations of their own.

Well, then what is it for which we are now met on this occasion? We have assembled to consider questions upon which depend our future, whether glorious or inglorious. It is our good fortune that we are under a rule which makes it possible for us to meet in this manner. (*Cheers.*) It is under the civilizing rule of the Queen and people of England that we meet here together, hindered by none, and are freely allowed to speak our minds without the least fear and without the least hesitation. Such a thing is possible under British rule and British rule only. (*Loud cheers.*) Then I put the *question* plainly: Is this Congress a nursery for sedition and rebellion against the British Government (*cries of no, no*); or is it another stone in the foundation of the stability of that Government (*cries of yes, yes*)? There could be but one answer, and that you have already given, because we are thoroughly sensible of the numberless blessings conferred upon us, of which the very existence of this Congress is a proof in a nutshell. (*Cheers.*) Were it not for these blessings of British rule I could not have come here, as I have done, without the least hesitation and without the least fear that my children might be robbed and killed in my absence; nor could you have come from every corner of the land, having performed, within a few days, journeys, which in former days would have occupied as many months. (*Cheers.*) These simple facts bring home to all of us at once some of those great and numberless blessings which British rule has conferred upon us. But there remain even greater blessings for which we have to be grateful. It is to British rule that we owe the education we possess; the people of England were sincere in the declarations made more than half a century ago that India was a sacred charge entrusted to their care by Providence, and that they were bound to administer it for the good of India, to the glory of their own name, and the satisfaction of God. (*Prolonged cheering.*) When we have to acknowledge so many blessings as flowing from British rule—and I could descant on them for hours, because it would simply be recounting to you the history of the British Empire in India—is it possible that an assembly like this, every one of whose members is fully impressed with the knowledge of these blessings, could meet for any purpose inimical to that rule to which we owe so much? (*Cheers.*)

The thing is absurd. Let us speak out like men and proclaim that we are loyal to the backbone (*cheers*); that we understand the benefits English rule has conferred upon us; that we thoroughly appreciate the education that has been given to us, the new light which has been poured upon us, turning us from darkness into light and teaching us the new lesson that kings are made for the people, not peoples for their kings; and this new lesson we have learned amidst the darkness of Asiatic despotism only by the light of free English civilization. (*Loud cheers.*) But the question is, do the Government believe us? Do they believe that we are really loyal to them; that we do truly appreciate and rely on British rule; that we veritably desire its permanent continuance; that our reason is satisfied and our sentimental feelings gratified as well as our self interest? It would be a great gratification to us if we could see in the inauguration of a great movement like this Congress, that what we do really mean and desire is thoroughly and truly so understood by our rulers. I have the good fortune to be able to place before you testimony which cannot be questioned, from which you will see that some at least of the most distinguished of our rulers do believe that what we say is sincere; and that we do *not* want to subvert British rule; that our outspoken utterances are as much for their good as for our good. They do believe, as Lord Ripon said, that what is good for India is good for England. I will give you first the testimony as regards the educated classes which was given 25 years ago by Sir Bartle Frere. He possessed an intimate knowledge of the people of this country, and with regard to the educated portion of them he gave this testimony. He said: 'And now wherever I go I find the best exponents of the policy of the English Government, and the most able co-adjutors in adjusting that policy to the peculiarities of the natives of India, among the ranks of the educated natives'. This much at least is testimony to our sincerity, and strongly corroborates our assertion that we, the educated classes, have become the true interpreters and mediators between the masses of our countrymen and our rulers. I shall now place before you the declaration of the Government of India itself, that they have confidence in the loyalty of the whole people, and do appreciate the sentiments of the educated classes in particular. I will read their very words. They say in a despatch addressed to the Secretary of State (8th June 1880): 'But the people of India accept British rule without any need for appeal to arms, because we keep the peace and do justice, because we have done and are doing much material good to the country and the people, and because there is not inside or outside India any power that can adequately occupy our place.' Then they distinctly understand that we do believe the British power to be the only power that can, under existing circumstances, really keep the peace, and advance our future progress. This is testimony as to the feeling of the whole people. But of the educated classes this despatch says: 'To the minds of at least the educated among the people of India—and the number is rapidly increasing—any idea of the subversion of British power is abhorrent, from the conciousness that it must result in the wildest anarchy and confusion.' (*Loud cheers.*)

We can, therefore, proceed with the utmost serenity and with every confidence that our rulers do understand us; that they do understand our motives, and give credit to our expressions of loyalty, and we need not in the least care for any impeachment of disloyalty or any charge of harbouring wild ideas of subverting the British power that may be put forth by ignorant, irresponsible or ill-disposed individuals or cliques. (*Loud cheers.*) We can therefore quietly, calmly and with entire confidence in our rulers, speak as freely as we please, but of course in that spirit of fairness and moderation which becomes wise and honest men, and in the tone which every gentleman, every reasonable being, would adopt when urging his rulers to make him some concession. (*Hear, hear.*) Now although, as I have said, the British Government have done much, very much for us, there is still a great deal more to be done if their noble work is to be fitly completed. They say this themselves; they show a desire to do what more may be required, and it is for us to ask for whatsoever, after due deliberation, we think that we ought to have. (*Cheers.*)

Therefore, having said thus much, and having cleared the ground so that we may proceed freely and in all confidence with the work of our Congress, I must at once come to the matter with which I should have commenced had I not purposely postponed it until I had explained the relations between ourselves and our rulers; and that is the most happy and auspicious occasion which the coming year is to bring us, *viz.*, the Jubilee of our good Queen-Empress' reign. (*Loud cheers.*) I am exceedingly glad that the Congress has thought it right to select this as the subject of the initial resolution, and in this to express, in humble but hearty terms, their congratulations to our Gracious Empress. (*Cheers.*) There is even more reason for us to congratulate ourselves on having for half a century enjoyed the rule of a Sovereign graced with every virtue, and truly worthy to reign over that vast Empire on which the sun never sets. (*Loud cheers.*) That she may live long, honoured and beloved, to continue for yet many years that beneficial and enlightened rule with which she has so long reigned, must be the heartfelt prayer of every soul in India. (*Prolonged cheering,*)

And here you must pardon me if I digress a moment from those subjects which this Congress proposes to discuss to one of those which we do not consider to fall within the legitimate sphere of its deliberations.

It has been asserted that this Congress ought to take up questions of social reforms (*cheers and cries of yes, yes*) and our failure to do this has been urged as a reproach against us. Certainly no member of this National Congress is more alive to the necessity of social reforms than I am; but, gentlemen, for everything there are proper times, proper circumstances, proper parties and proper places (*cheers*); we are met together as a political body to represent to our rulers our political aspirations, not to discuss social reforms, and if you blame us for ignoring these you should equally blame the House of Commons for not discussing the abstruser problems on mathematics or metaphysics. But, besides this, there are here Hindus of every caste, amongst whom, even in the same provinces, customs and social

arrangements differ widely,—there are Mahomedans and Christians of various denominations, Parsees, Sikhs, Brahmos and what not—men indeed of each and all of those numerous classes which constitute in the aggregate the people of India. (*Loud cheers.*) How can this gathering of *all* classes discuss the social reforms needed in each individual class? What do any of us know of the internal home life, of the customs, traditions, feelings, prejudices of any class but our own? How could a gathering, a cosmopolitan gathering like this, discuss to any purpose the reforms needed in any one class? Only the members of that class can effectively deal with the reforms therein needed. A National Congress must confine itself to questions in which the entire nation has a direct participation, and it must leave the adjustment of social reforms and other class questions to class Congresses. But it does not follow that, because this national, political body does not presume to discuss social reforms, the delegates here present are not just as deeply, nay in many, cases far more deeply, interested in these questions than in those political questions we do discuss, or that those several communities whom those delegates represent are not doing their utmost to solve those complicated problems on which hinge the practical introduction of those reforms. Any man who has eyes and ears open must know what struggles towards higher and better things are going on in every community: and it could not be otherwise with the noble education we are receiving. Once you begin to think about your own actions, your duties and responsibilities to yourself, your neighbours and your nation, you cannot avoid looking round and observing much that is wrong amongst you; and we know as a fact that each community is now doing its best according to its lights, and the progress that it has made in education. I need not I think particularise. The Mahomedans know what is being done by persons of their community to push on the education their brethren so much need; the Hindus are everywhere doing what they *can* to reform those social institutions which they think require improvement. There is not one single community here represented of which the best and ablest men do not feel that much has to be done to improve the social, moral, religious status of their brethren, and in which, as a fact, they are not striving to effect, gradually those needful improvements; but these are essentially matters too delicate for a stranger's handling—matters which must be left to the guidance of those who alone fully understand them in all their bearings, and which are wholly unsuited to discussion in an assemblage like this in which all classes are intermingled (*Loud cheers.*)

I shall now refer briefly to the work of the former Congress. Since it met last year, about this time, some progress, I am glad to say, has been made, and that is an encouragement and a proof that if we do really ask what is right and reasonable, we may be sure that, sooner or later, the British Government will actually give what we ask for. We should therefore persevere, having confidence in the conscience of England, and resting assured that the English nation will grudge no sacrifice to prove the sincerity of their desire to do whatever is just and right. (*Cheers.*)

Our first request at the last Congress was for the constitution of a Royal Commission. Unfortunately the authorities in England have not seen their way to grant a Royal Commission. They say it will upset the authorities here; that it will interfere with the prestige and control of the Government here. I think that this is a very poor compliment to our rulers on this side. If I understand a man like Lord Dufferin, of such vast experience in administration, knowing, as he does, what it is to rule an empire, it would be impossible for him to be daunted and frightened by a commission making enquires here. I think this argument a very poor one, and we must once more say that to the inhabitants of India a Parliamentry Committee taking evidence in England alone can never be satisfactory, for the simple reason that what the Committee will learn by the ear will never enable them to understand what they ought to see with their eyes if they are to realize what the evidence of the witnesses really means. Still, however, it is so far satisfactory that, notwithstanding the change of Government and the vicissitudes which this poor Parliamentary Committee has undergone, it is the intention of Parliament that under any and all circumstances a Committee shall be appointed. At the same time this Committee *in futuro* ties the hands of the authorities here to a large extent and prevents us from saying all we do really want.

Another resolution on which we must report some progress was to the effect that the N. W. Provinces and the Punjab ought also to have Legislative Councils of their own. We know that the Government has just given a Legislative Council to the N. W. Provinces, and we hope that this progress may extend further and satisfy our wishes as to other provinces also.

The fourth resolution had regard to the Service question. In this matter we really seem to have made some distinct progress. The Public Service Commission is now sitting, and if one thing more than another can prove that the Government is sincere in its desire to do something for us, this appointment of such a Commission is that thing. You perhaps remember the words which our noble Viceroy used at Poona. He said: "However, I will say that from first to last I have been a strong advocate for the appointment of a Committee or Commission of this sort, and that when succeeding Governments in England changed, I have on each occasion warmly impressed upon the Secretary of State the necessity of persevering in the nomination of a Commission. I am happy to think that in response to my earnest representations on the subject, Her Majesty's present Ministers have determined to take action. I consequently do not really see what more during the short period I have been amongst you, the Government of India could have done for that most important and burning question which was perpetually agitating your mind, and was being put forward by the natives as an alleged injustice done to the educated native classes of this country in not allowing them adequate employment in the Public Service. I do not think you can point out to me any other question which so occupied public attention or was nearer to the hearts of your people. Now the door to inquiry has been opened, and it only

remains for you, by the force of logic of your representations and of the evidence you may be able to submit, to make good your case ; if you succeed in doing so, all I can say is, that nobody will be better pleased than myself. In regard to other matters, which have been equally prominent in your newspapers and your addresses, and which have been so constantly discussed by your associations, I have also done my best to secure for you an ample investigation."

There we have his own words as to his intentions and the efforts he made to get this Commission. This should convince us of his good faith and sympathy with us. When I think of Lord Dufferin, not only as our present Viceroy, but bearing in mind all we know of him in his past career, I should hesitate to believe that he could be a man devoid of the deepest sympathy with any people struggling to advance and improve their political condition. Some of you may remember one or two extracts which I gave in my Holbern Town Hall speech from Lord Dufferin's letters to the *Times*, and I cannot conceive that a person of such warm sympathies could fail to sympathise with us. But I may say this much that, feeling as I naturally do some interest about the views and intentions of our Viceroys and Governors, I have had the opportunity of getting some information from friends on whom I can rely and who are in a position to know the truth; and I am able to say in the words of one of these friends that 'the Viceroy's instincts are eminently liberal, and he regards with neither jealousy nor alarm the desire of the educated classes to be allowed a larger share in the administration of their own affairs. Indeed he considers it very creditable to them that they should do so.' As Viceroy he has to consider all sides of a question from the ruler's point of view, and to act as he thinks safe and proper. But we may be sure that we have his deep and very genuine sympathy, and we may fairly claim and expect much good at his hands.

But yet further I would enquire whether the intentions of the Secretary of State for India and of the other home authorities are equally favourable to our claims. The resolution on its very face tells us what the intention of the Secretary of State is. It says : ' In regard to its object the Commission would, broadly speaking, be required to devise a scheme which may reasonably be hoped to possess the necessary elements of finality, and to do full justice to the claims of natives of India to a higher and more extensive employment in the Public Service.'

There we have the highest authority making a declaration that he desires to do full justice to the claims of the natives of India. Now, our only reply is that we are thankful for the enquiry, and we hope that we may be able to satisfy all, that what we ask is both reasonable and right.

As another proof of the intentions of our British rulers, as far back as 53 years ago, when the natives of India did not themselves fully understand their rights, the statesmen of England of their own free will decided what the policy of England ought to be towards India. Long and important was the debate ; the question was discussed from all points of view ; the danger of giving political power to the people, the insufficiency of their capacity and other considerations were all fully

weighed, and the conclusion was come to in unmistakable and unambiguous terms, that the policy of British rule should be a policy of justice *(cheers)*, the policy of the advancement of one-sixth of the human race *(Cheers)*, India was to be regarded as a trust placed by God in their hands, and in the due discharge of that trust they resolved that they would follow the 'plain path of duty,' as Mr. Macaulay called it; on that occasion he said, virtually, that he would rather see the people of India free and able to govern themselves than that they would remain the bondsmen of Great Britain and the obsequious toadies of British officials. *(Cheers.)* This was the essence of the policy of 1833, and in the Act of that year it was laid down: 'That no native of the said territories, nor any natural-born subject of His Majesty resident therein shall, by reason only of his religion, place of birth, descent color or any of them be disabled from holding any place, office or employment under the said Company.' *(Prolonged cheering.)*

We do not, we could not, ask for more than this; and all we have to press upon the Commission and Government is that they should now honestly grant us in practice here what Great Britain freely conceded to us 50 years ago, when we ourselves were too little enlightened even to ask for it. *(Loud cheers.)*

We next passed through a time of trouble, and the British arms were triumphant. When they had completely surmounted all their difficulties, and completely vanquished all their adversaries, the English nation came forward, animated by the same high and noble resolves as before, and gave us that glorious proclamation which we should for ever prize and reverence as our Magna Charta—greater even than the Charter of 1833. I need not repeat that glorious proclamation now, for it is engraven on all your hearts *(loud cheers)*; but it constitutes such a grand and glorious charter of our liberties that I think every child as it begins to gather intelligence and to lisp its mother-tongue, ought to be made to commit it to memory. *(Cheers)*. In that proclamation we have again a confirmation of the policy of 1833 and something more. In it are embodied the germs of all that we aim at now, of all that we can desire hereafter. *(Cheers.)* We have only to go before the Government and the Commission now sitting and repeat it, and say that all we want is only what has already been granted to us in set terms by that proclamation, and that all we now ask for is that the great and generous concessions therein made to us in words shall actually be made ours by deeds. *(Loud cheers)* I will not, however enter into further details, for it is a subject on which I should be led into speaking for hours, and even then I should fail to convey to you an adequate idea of all that is in my heart. I have said enough to show our rulers that our case is complete and has been made out by themselves. *(Cheers.)* It is enough for me therefore to stop at this point.

Another resolution is the improvement and enlargement of the Legislative Councils, and the introduction into them of an elective element, but that is one on which my predecessor in the chair has so ably descanted that I do not think I should take up more of your time with it. I need only say that in this matter we hope to make a further advance, and shall try to place before our rulers what we consider

a possible scheme for the introduction of an elective element into the Legislative Councils. I need not say that if this representation is introduced, the greatest benefit will be conferred upon the Government itself, because at present whatever Acts they pass that do not quite please us, we, whether rightly or wrongly, grumble and grumble against the Government, and the Government only. It is true that we have some of our own people in Councils. But we have no right to demand any explanation, even from them; they are not our representatives, and the Government cannot relieve themselves from any dissatisfaction we may feel against any law we don't like. If our own representatives make a mistake and get a law passed which we do not want, the Government at any rate will escape the greater portion of the consequent unpopularity. They will say—here are your own representatives; we believed that they represented your wishes, and we passed the law. On the other hand with all the intelligence, all the superior knowledge of the English officials, let them come as angels from heaven, it is impossible for them to enter into the feelings of the people, and feel as they feel, and enter into their minds (*Cheers.*) It is not any disparagement of them, but in the nature of things it cannot be otherwise. If you have therefore your representatives to represent your feelings, you will then have an opportunity of getting something which is congenial and satisfactory to yourself; and what will be satisfactory to you must also be satisfactory to and good for the Government itself. (*Cheers.*)

This brings me also to the point of representation in Parliament. All the most fundamental questions on which hinge the entire form and character of the administration here are decided by Parliament. No matter what it is, Legislative Councils the Services,—nothing can be reformed until Parliament moves and enacts modifications of the existing Acts. Not one single genuine Indian voice is there in Parliament to tell at least what the native view is on any question. This was most forcibly urged upon me by English gentlemen who are in Parliament themselves; they said they always felt it to be a great defect in Parliament, that it did not contain one single genuine representative of the people of India.

One of the questions which will be placed before this Congress and will be discussed by them, is the deep sympathy which this Congress feels for the poverty of the people. It is often understood and thought that when we struggle for admission into the Services it is simply to gratify the aspirations of the few educated. But if you examine this question thoroughly, you will find that this matter of the Public Services will go far to settle the problem of the poverty of the Indian people. One thing I congratulate myself upon. I don't trouble you with any testimony about the poverty of India. You have the testimony of Sir Evelyn Baring given only a couple of years ago, who told us in plain terms that the people of India were extremely poor, and also of the present Finance Minister who repeats those words. But amongst the several causes which are at the bottom of our sufferings, this one, and that the most important cause, is beginning to be realized by our rulers, and that is a step of the most hopeful and promising kind. In the discussion about the currency, the Secretary of State for India, in

a letter to the Treasury of the 26th January 1886, makes certain remarks which show that our rulers now begin to understand and to try to grapple with the problem ; and are not, ostrich-like, shutting their eyes to it. I was laughed at when I first mooted the question of the poverty of India, and assigned as one of its causes the employment of an expensive foreign agency. But now the highest authority emphasizes this view. The Secretary of State, in the letter just referred to, said : 'The position of India in relation to taxation and the sources of the public revenues is very peculiar, not merely from the habits of the people and their strong aversion to change, which is more specially exhibited towards new forms of taxation, but likewise from the character of the Government, which is in the hands of foreigners, who hold all the principal administrative offices, and form so large a part of the Army. The impatience of new taxation which would have to be borne, wholly as a consequence of the foreign rule imposed on the country and virtually to meet additions to charges arising outside of ths country would constitute a political danger, the real magnitude of which, it is to be feared, is not at all appreciated by persons who have no knowledge of, or concern in, the Government of India, but which those responsible for that Government have long regarded as of the most serious order.'

We may be sure that the public conscience of England will ask why the natives of India, after a hundred years of British rule, are so poor ; and as John Bull, in a cartoon in *Punch* is represented as doing, will wonder that India is a beggar when he thought she had a mint of money.

Unfortunately this idea of India's wealth is utterly delusive, and if a proper system of representation in the Councils be conceded, our representatives will then be able to make clear to these Councils and to our rulers those causes which are operating to undermine our wealth and prosperity, and guide the Government to the proper remedies for the greatest of all evils—the poverty of the masses. All the benefits we have derived from British rule, all the noble projects of our British rulers, will go for nothing if after all the country is to continue sinking deeper and deeper into the abyss of destitution. At one time I was denounced as a Pessimist but now that we have it on the authority of our rulers themselves that we are *very* poor, it has become the right, as well as the duty, of this Congress to set forth its convictions, both as to this widespread destitution and the primary steps needful for its alleviation. Nothing is more dear to the heart of England—and I speak from actual knowledge—than India's welfare ; and if we only speak out loud enough, and persistently enough, to reach that busy heart, we shall not speak in vain. (*Prolonged cheering.*) There will be several other questions brought before the Congress at their Committee meetings during the next three days, and I am sure from the names of the delegates, as far as I am informed, that they will prosecute their deliberations with all possible moderation. I am sure that they will fully appreciate the benefits of the rule under which they live, while the fact that our rulers are willing to do whatever we can show them to be necessary for our welfare, should be enough to encourage all in the work. I do not know that I need now detain you with any

further remarks. You have now some idea of what progress has been made in respect of the matters which were discussed last year. I hope we may congratulate ourselves next year that we have made further progress in attaining the objects alike of the past year's resolutions and those we may this year pass. I for one am hopeful that, if we are only true to ourselves, if we only do justice to ourselves and the noble education which has been given to us by our rulers and speak freely, with the freedom of speech which has been granted to us, we may fairly expect our Government to listen to us and to grant us our reasonable demands. (*Loud cheers.*)

I will conclude this short address by repeating my sincere thanks to all of you for having placed me in this honourable position and by again returning thanks to our Bengal brethren on behalf of all the delegates whom they have so cordially welcomed here.

Third Congress—Madras—1887

THE HON. MR. BUDRUDIN TYABJI.

Rajah Sir T. Madava Rao and Gentlemen,—I thank you most sincerely for the very great honor you have done me by electing me President of this great national assembly. (*Applause*). Gentlemen, it is impossible not to feel proud of the great distinction you have thus conferred upon me, the greatest distinction which it is in your power to confer upon any one of your countrymen. (*Loud and continued applause.*) Gentlemen, I have had the honor of witnessing great public meetings both in Bombay and elsewhere, but it is quite a novel sensation for me to appear before a meeting of this description—a meeting composed not merely of the representatives of any one city or even of one province—but of the whole of the vast continent of India,—representing not any one class or interest but all classes (*hear, hear, and applause*) and all interests of the almost innumerable different communities that constitute the people of India. (*Applause.*)

Gentlmen, I had not the good fortune to be present at the proceedings of the first Congress, held in Bombay in 1885, nor had I the good fortune to take part in the deliberations of the second Congress, held in Calcutta last year. But, gentlemen, I have carefully read the proceedings of both those Congresses, and I have no hesitation in declaring that they display an amount of talent, wisdom and eloquence of which we have every reason to be proud. (*Applause.*)

Gentlemen, from the proceedings of the two past Congresses, I think we are fairly entitled to hope that the proceedings of this present Congress will not only be marked by those virtues, but by that moderation and by that sobriety of judgment which is the offspring of political wisdom and political experience. (*Applause.*) Gentlemen, all the friends and well-wishers of India, and all those who take an interest in watching over the progress and prosperity of our people, have every reason to rejoice at the increasing success of each succeeding Congress. At the first Congress in Bombay, in 1885, we had less than 100 representatives from the different parts of India, in the second Congress, at Calcutta, in 1886, we had as many as 440 representatives, while at this Congress, I believe we have over 600 delegates (*applause*) representing all the different parts and all the different communities of this great empire. I think, then, gentlemen, that we are fairly entitled to say that this is a truly representative national gathering. (*Hear, hear and applause.*) Indeed, if that tentative form of representative institutions which has so often been asked for, from Government, were granted to us, I have not the smallest doubt but that many of the Gentlemen, I now have the honor of addressing, would be elected by their respective constituencies to represent their interests. (*Applause.*)

Gentlemen, it has been urged in derogation of our character, as a representative national gathering, that one great and important community—the Mussulman community—has kept aloof from the proceedings of the two last Congresses. Now, gentlemen, in the first place, this is only partially true and applies only to one particular part of India, and has moreover, due to certain special, local, and temporary causes (*hear, hear, and applause*), and in the second place, no such reproach can, I think, with any show of justice be urged against this present Congress (applause) and gentlemen, I must honestly confess to you that one great motive which has induced me in the present state of my health, to undertake the grave responsibilites of presiding over your deliberations, has been an earnest desire, on my part, to prove, as far as in my power lies, that I, at least, not merely in my individual capacity, but as representing the Anjuman-i-Islam of Bombay (*loud applause*), do not consider that there is anything whatever in position or the relations of the different communities of India,—be they Hindus, Mussulmans, Parsees, or Christians—which should induce the leaders of any one community to stand aloof from the others in their efforts to obtain those great general reforms, those great general rights which are for the common benefit of us all (*hear, hear and applause*) and which, I feel assured, have only to be earnestly and unanimously pressed upon Government to be granted to us.

Gentlemen, it is undoubtedly true that each one of our great Indian communities has its own peculiar social, moral, educational and even political difficulties to surmount—but so far as general political questions affecting the whole of India—such as those which alone are discussed by this Congress—are concerned, I, for one, am utterly at a loss to understand why Mussulmans should not work shoulder to shoulder (*hear, hear and applause*) with their fellow-countrymen, of

other races and creeds, for the common benefit of all. (*Applause.*) Gentlemen, this is the principle on which we, in the Bombay Presidency, have always acted and from the number, the character, the position, and the attainments of Mussulman delegates from the Bengal Presidency and from the Presidency of Madras as well as from the North-West Provinces and the Punjab, I have not the smallest doubt that this is also the view held, with but few, though, perhaps, important exceptions, by the leaders of the Mussulman communities throughout the whole of India. (*Hear, hear and applause.*)

Gentlemen, it has been urged as a slur upon our loyalty that this Congress is composed of what are called the educated natives of India. Now, if by this it is intended to be conveyed, that we are merely a crowd of people with nothing but our education to commend us, if it is intended to be conveyed that the gentry, the nobility and the aristocracy of the land have kept aloof from us, I can only meet that assertion by the most direct and the most absolute denial. (*Hear, hear and applause.*) To any person who made that assertion I should feel inclined to say, come with me into this Hall (*applause*) and look around you, (*applause*) and tell me where you could wish to see a better representation of the aristocracy, not only of birth and of wealth, but of intellect, education, and position, than you see gathered within the walls of this Hall. (*Applause.*) But, gentlemen, if no such insinuation is intended to be made, I should only say, that I am happy to think that this Congress does consist of the educated natives of India. (*Hear, hear.*)

Gentlemen, I, for one, am proud to be called not only educated but a "native" of this country. (*Applause and hear, hear.*) And, gentlemen, I should like to know, where among all the millions of Her Majesty's subjects in India are to be found more truly loyal, nay, more devoted friends of the British empire than among these educated natives. (*Loud and continued applause.*) Gentlemen, to be a true and a sincere friend of the British Government, it is necessary that one should be in a position to appreciate the great blessings which that Government has conferred upon us, and I should like to know who is in a better position to appreciate these blessings—the ignorant peasants or the educated natives? Who, for instance, will better appreciate the advantages of good roads, railways, telegraphs and post offices, schools, colleges and universities, hc good laws and impartial courts of justice?—the educated natives or the ignorant peasants of this country? (*Applause.*) Gentlemen, if there ever were to arise—which God forbid—any great struggle between Russia and Great Britain for supremacy in this country—who is more likely, to judge better of the relative merits of the two empires? (*Hear, hear.*) Again I say, gentlemen, that in these matters it is the educated natives that are best qualified to judge, because it is we, who know and are best able to appreciate—for instance,—the blessings of the right of public meeting, the liberty of action, and of speech, and high education which we enjoy under Great Britain, whereas, probably, under Russia we should have nothing but a haughty and despotic Government whose chief glory would consist in vast military organization, aggression upon our neighbours, and great military exploits. (*Applause.*)

No, gentlemen, let our opponents say what they please, we, the educated natives, by the mere force of our education, must be the best appreciators of the blessings of a civilized and enlightened Government and, therefore, in our own interests, the best and staunchest supporters of the British Government in India. (*Applause.*) But, gentlemen, do those who thus charge us with disloyalty stop for a moment to consider the full meaning and effect of their argument,—do they realize the full import and significance of the assertion they make? Do they understand that, in charging us with disloyalty, they are, in reality, condemning and denouncing the very government which it is their intention to support. (*Hear, hear, loud and continued applause.*) For, gentlemen, when they say that the educated natives of India are disloyal, what does it mean? It means this: that in the opinion of the educated natives,—that is to say, of all the men of light and leading, all those who have received a sound, liberal and enlightened education, all those who are acquainted with the history of their own country and with the nature of the present and past governments, that in the opinion of all these—the English Government is so bad that it has deserved to forfeit the confidence and the loyalty of the thinking part of the population. (*Hear, hear and applause.*) Now, gentlemen, is it conceivable that a more frightful and unjust condemnation of the British Government can be pronounced than is implied in this charge of disloyalty against the educated natives of India? Gentlemen, if this charge were brought by some bitter enemies of Great Britain, if it were brought by the Russians,—for example—I could understand it. (*Hear, hear*). But it is almost beyond my comprehension that it should come, not from enemies, but, from the supposed friends of the British Government, (*loud laughter, and hear, hear*) not from the Russians, but from Englishmen, (*hear, hear*) who presumably want, not to destroy, but to support their Government! I say it surpasses my comprehension. (*Loud applause.*) Gentlemen, just consider for a moment the effect of this reckless allegation upon the uneducated millions of the inhabitants of this country, upon the hordes of the Russians in the North, and upon the enlightened nations of Europe! I say, therefore, that the conduct of those who thus recklessly charge us with disloyalty resembles the conduct of the "foolish woodman" who was lopping off the very branch of the tree upon which he was standing (*hear, hear, loud applause and loud laughter*) unconscious that the destruction of the branch meant the destruction of himself. (*Applause and laughter.*)

Happily, however, gentlemen, this allegation is as absurd as it is unfounded. It is as unjust to us as it is unjust to the Government it impeaches. But, though, gentlemen, I maintain that the educated natives, as a class, are loyal to the backbone (*hear, hear,*), I must yet admit that some of our countrymen are not always guarded, not always cautious, in the language they employ. I must admit that some of them do sometimes afford openings for hostile criticisms, and I must say that I have myself observed in some of the Indian newspapers and in the speeches of public speakers, sentiments and expressions which are calculated to lead one to the conclusion that they have not fully realised the distinction between license

and liberty; that they have not wholly grasped the lesson, that freedom has its responsibilities no less than its privileges. (*Hear, hear.*) And, therefore, gentlemen, I trust that not only during the debates of this Congress, but on all occasions we shall ever bear in mind and ever impress upon our countrymen that, if we are to enjoy the right of public discussion, the liberty of speech and liberty of the press, we must so conduct ourselves as to demonstrate by our conduct, by our moderation, by the justness of our criticisms, that we fully deserve these—the greatest blessings which an enlightened Government can confer upon its subjects. (*Hear, hear and applause.*)

Gentlemen, it has been sometimes urged that Europeans in this country do not fully sympathise with the just aspirations of the natives of India. In the first place, this is not universally true, because I have the good fortune to know many Europeans than whom truer or more devoted friends of India do not breathe on the face of the earth. (*Here, hear and applause.*) And, in the second place, we must be prepared to make very considerable allowances for our European fellow-subjects, because their position in this country is surrounded by difficult and complicated questions not merely of a political but of a social character, which tend more or less, to keep the two communities asunder in spite of the best efforts of the leaders of European no less than of native society. Gentlemen, so long as our European friends come to this country as merely temporary residents, so long as they come here merely for the purpose, of trade, commerce or of a professino so long as they do not look upon India as a country in whose welfare they are permanently interested, so long it will be impossible for us to expect that the majority of the Europeans should fraternize with us upon all great public questions (*hear, hear,*) and it has, therefore, always seemed to me that one of the greatest, the most difficult, the most complicated and, at the same time, one of the most important problems to be solved is how to make our European friends look upon India as in some sense their own country, even by adoption. For, gentlemen, if we could but induce our retired merchants, engineers, doctors, solicitors, barristers, judges and civilians to make India permanently their home, (*hear, hear and applause*) what an amount of talent and ability, political experience and ripe judgment, we should retain in India, for the benefit of us all. (*Applause.*) All those great questions in regard to the financial drain on India and those questions arising from jealousy of races and the rivalry for public employment—would at once disappear. And when we speak of the poverty of India, because of the draining away of vast sums of money from India to England, it has always seemed to me strange, that so little thought should be bestowed upon the question of the poverty of our resources caused by the drain of so many men of public, political and intellectual eminence from our shores every year. (*Applause*)

Now, gentlemen, one word as to the scope of our action and deliberations. It has been urged—solemnly urged—as an objection against our proceedings—that this Congress does not discuss the question of Social Reform. But, gentlemen, this matter has already been fully dealt with by my friend, Mr. Dadabhai Naoroji, who

presided over your deliberations last year. And I must confess that the objection seems to me strange seeing that this Congress is composed of the representatives, not of any one class or community, not of one part of India, but of all the different parts, and of all the different classes, and of all the different communities of India. Whereas any question of Social Reform must of necessity affect some particular part or some particular community of India only,— and, therefore, gentlemen, it seems to me, that although, we, Mussalmans, have our own social problems to solve, just as our Hindu and Parsee friends have theirs, yet, these questions can be best dealt with by the leaders of the particular communities to which they relate. (*Applause.*) I, therefore, think, gentlemen, that the only wise, and, indeed the only possible course we can adopt is to confine our discussions to such questions as affect the whole of India at large, and to abstain from the discussion of questions that affect a particular part or a particular community only. (*Loud applause.*)

Gentlemen, I do not, at present at least, propose to say anything upon the various problems that will be submitted to you for your consideration. I have no doubt that the questions will be discussed in a manner and in a spirit that will reflect credit upon us all. I will only say this : be moderate in your demands, be just in your criticism, be accurate in your facts, be logical in your conclusions and you may rest assured that any propositions you may make to our rulers will be received with that benign consideration which is the characteristic of a strong and enlightened Government. (*Applause.*) And now, gentlemen, I fear, I have already trespassed (*voices of* ' *no, no,*') too long upon your time. Before I sit down, I will once more offer to you my thanks from the very bottom of my heart for the very great honor you have done me, and I pray to God that I may be enabled, in some measure, at least, to deserve your approbation and justify the choice you have made and the confidence you have reposed in me. (*Loud applause.*) Gentlemen, I wish this Congress and all succeeding Congresses, every success and every prosperity. (*Applause.*)

I am very glad to see the representatives of so many different communities and parts of India gathered together this afternoon before us. This, in itself, gentlemen, is no small advantage that we, as representatives of the different parts of India, should have the opportunity of meeting and discussing together the various problems that affect us all. (*Applause.*) Gentlemen, I will not take up much more of your time. I say, as our Chairman, Sir T. Madava Rao has said :— I welcome you here—but at the same time I cannot help expressing my deep regret, a regret that I know you all share, that on this occasion we are deprived of the aid and counsel of some of those gentlemen who laboured most earnestly for and who graced with their presence the Congress on previous occasions, and who have now, all too soon for their country's sake, passed from amongst us. Among the friends we have lost are Dr. Athalye, of Bombay and Madras, who took such an energetic part in the first Congress held in Bombay in the year 1885, and Mr. Girija Bhusar Mookerjee whom you all know, and whom all who knew, loved and respected, and who was one of the most active workers for the Con-

gress, held in Calcutta, last year. Then, too, we have to mourn the loss of Mr. Dayaram Jethmall, the founder of the National Party in Sind, and a distinguished gentleman belonging to this Presidency, (though I fear I am not in a position to pronounce his name correctly), Mr. Singaraju Venkata Subbaroyudu of Masulipatam. But, to all these gentlemen, of whose assistence and guidance we have been deprived, we must owe a lasting debt of gratitude. They, in their lifetime, spared no pains to make the Congress, either in Bombay or Calcutta, a success, as far as in their power lay, and it only remains for us, while cherishing their memories, to emulate, their example. (*Loud and continued applause.*)

Gentlemen, in addition to those of you, who have been able to come to Madras, we have received numerous letters and telegrams from Associations of various kinds, and from a large number of representative men in other parts of India, who for some reason or other, have been debarred from being represented at, or attending, this Congress. We have received telegrams from Hyderabad, from all kinds of places in the Madras Presidency.—the names of which I shall not venture to pronounce,—from Kurrachi, Calcutta, Dehra Dun, Sambhur, Bangalore, Dacca, from His Highness the Maharaja of Durbungah, Messrs. Lal Mohun and Manomohan Ghose, Mr. Telang, and a vast number of other places and persons too numerous for me to pretend to recapitulate. There are no less than sixty odd telegrams alone placed before me. But, gentlemen, there is one among those which I am particularly anxious to bring to your notice, and that is from our old and distinguished friend, Mr. Atkins, (*laughter*), whom by name, at least, I have not the smallest doubt, every one of us here perfectly knows, (*Applause.*) Gentlemen, in his telegram, he wishes this Congress and all future Congresses perfect success. (*Applause.*) He wishes that the unity of the different communities should be promoted and that the objects which we all have at heart should be attained. (*Applause.*) I think you will be of opinion that that is a very good omen. We want the assistance not only of representative men of the Indian communities, but we also want the assistance of Europeans. (*Applause.*) Gentlemen, while we are attempting to learn some few lessons in the art of Self Government, our European friends have inherited that art from their forefathers after centuries of experience, and it cannot be doubted that if we can induce our European friends to co-operate with us in these various political matters, which in point of fact affect them no less than they affect us, it cannot, I say, be doubted that it will conduce to the advantage, not only of ourselves, but of the European community also. (*Loud applause.*)

Fourth Congress—Allahabad—1888.

Mr. George Yule.

GENTLEMEN,—When I was asked some time ago to allow myself to be nominated for the position to which you have now elected me, I had some hesitation in giving my assent to the request. It was an unexpected, and with all due deference to the judgement of my too indulgent friends, it was an undeserved compliment. That, however, is a kind of objection which can always and very easily be got over. But I knew your assemblies were very large, and I also know that it is a most desirable quality in the President of such a gathering to have a voice strong enough to reach the remotest listener. I feared I had no such voice. For that reason chiefly, and for others that need not be mentioned, I felt, I hope with unaffected diffidence, that I was scarcely the man to follow those magnificent speakers who had occupied the chair at previous meetings of the Congress. Nevertheless, quickened by my warm sympathies with the main objects of the Congress, I am here at your call, for better or for worse. (*Cheers.*)

And now, Gentlemen, I come at once to the business that lies before us. Why are we here? What do we want? What are we striving after? In the resolutions that are to be submitted to you there are some reforms embodied, which state our wants, which set forth our views, and indicate the direction in which our thoughts are travelling. I thing I am right, however, in saying that all these do not occupy exactly the same place in our regards. About one or two of them there is more or less of doubt as to their value or importance. But there is one of them respecting which there is the most complete and perfect unanimity of opinion. I refer to the reform of the Legislative Councils. I myself regard this one as the most important of all. Each of the other reforms begins and ends with itself. The reform of the Councils is not only in itself good, but it has the additional virtue of being the best of all instruments for obtaining other reforms that further experience and our growing wants may lead us to desire. (*Loud cheers.*) With your permission I will confine the observations I have to make to this one question. In doing so, it seems to me to be needful first of all to state some of the facts connected with the origin of the Bill under which the affairs of India are at present administered. When the sole Government of this country was taken over by the Crown in 1858, it fell to the lot of Lord Palmerston, who was then Prime Minister, to introduce into the House of Commons a Bill which was afterwards known as India Bill No. 1. The main provisions of this Bill were, that the Government of India was to vest in a Viceroy and Council in India, and a Council of eight retired Indian officials presided over by a Secretary of State in London. The proceedings of these two separate bodies, each of whom had certain

independent responsibilities, were to be subject to the review and final decision of the House of Commons. The chief objection to this Bill was, that no provision was made for the representation of the people of the country. Mr. Disraeli, who was leader of the Opposition, objected to it on the ground of the insufficient check which it provided; and he said that with such Councils as those proposed, "you could not be sure that the inhabitants of India would be able to obtain that redress from the grievances under which they suffered, that English protection ought to insure." Almost immediately after the introduction of the Bill, Lord Palmerston was defeated upon a side question, and Lord Derby became Prime Minister with Mr. Disraeli as leader of the House of Commons. No time was lost by the new Ministry in introducing India Bill No. 2. Mr. Disraeli dwelt upon the desirability of having the representative principle applied to the Government of the country, and his scheme was to increase the Council in London, which was proposed by Lord Palmerston, from eight to eighteen Members, half of whom were to be elected and were, in all other respects, to be entirely independent of Government. He regretted that the unsettled state of the country did not admit of a representation of the people in India itself, and all that could be done in the meantime was to approach as near to that form of Government as the circumstances would permit. The provisions of his Bill to effect that purpose were briefly these: Four of the elected half of the Council were to be members of the Indian Civil and Military Services of ten years' standing, and the remaining five must have been engaged in trading with India for at least five years. The constituency electing the four members connected with the services was to consist of all officers of both branches of the India service, and also of all residents in India owning £ 2,000 of an Indian railway or £ 1,000 of Goverment stock. The five mercantile members were to be elected by the Parliamentary constituences of London, Belfast, Liverpool, Manchester and Glasgow. So deeply ingrained is this notion of Government by representation in the minds of Englishmen, that, rather than leave it out of sight altogether in dealing with the affairs of India, the Government of that day made the proposals I have stated. Although the intention underlying these proposals was applauded, the scheme itself was felt to be, from the imperfect character of the constituencies, wholly inadequate to secure the check that was desired. It was clear, or rather it soon became clear, that the interests of one set of voters were adverse to the interests of the mass of the people, and that the other set knew absolutely nothing of the country or its wants. Received with favour, at first, the Bill soon became the object of jest and derision on the part of the Opposition, and even its more impartial critics said of it that it was useless offering to the people of India, under the name of bread, what would certainly turn out to be a stone. At the suggestion of Lord John Russell, the Bill was withdrawn, and the House proceeded by way of resolution to construct the famework of another Bill. The plan finally adopted was this: the Legislative and Administrative powers were to be entrusted to a Viceroy and a Council in India, and the check upon them was to be a Council of fifteen Members sittting in London. This Council was to be responsible to the Cabinet

through a Secretary of State, who was to be responsible in turn to the House of Commons. This arrangement was regarded merely as a provisional one, and the policy to be pursued was to work up to the constitutional standard. Education was to be largely extended and improved, and the natives of the country were to be drafted into the service of Government as they became qualified with the view, among other reasons, to fit them for the anticipated enlargement of their political powers. (*Hear, hear,*) The promises made and the prospects held out in the debates in Parliament derived a lustre from the famous proclamation of the Queen—that half fulfilled charter of India's rights,—which was first read and published to the people of India in this very city of Allahabad thirty years ago. (*Loud cheers.*) Now, what I wish to impress upon your minds by this brief narrative is the great importance that was attached at that time to some sort of constitutional check. Failing to have it in the form that the English people themselves approved and followed in the management of their own affairs, they devised the substitute with its threefold check that I have mentioned. Parliament itself was full of gushing enthusiasm as to the part it would take in the business. In the absence of a representative body in India, the House of Commons was to play the rôle of one on our behalf. It was to regard the work as a great and solemn trust committed to it by an all-wise and inscrutable Providence, the duties of which it would faithfully and fully discharge. Such was the style of language employed both in and out of Parliament at the time I allued to. And now what is the actual state of the case? It is summed up in a single sentence. There is no check. The Bill under which our affairs are administered appears, like many other Bills, to be open to more than one interpretation. The interpretation put upon it at the time, and what was probably the intention of Parliament, was this: the Government in India was to have the right of the initative; the Council in London the right of review and the Secretary of State, subject to the ultimate judgment of the House of Commons, the right of veto. And this was partically the relations of the parties until 1870. In that year the Duke of Argyle was Secretary of State; and in a controversy on this subject with Lord Mayo, who was then Viceroy, he laid down quite another doctrine. He held that the Government in India had no independent power at all, and that the prerogative of the Secretary of State was not limited to a veto of the measures passed in India. "The Government in India," he maintained, "were merely Executive Officers of the Home Government, who hold the ultimate power of requiring the Governor-General to introduce a measure and of requiring also all the Official Members of the Council to vote for it." This power-absorbing Despatch is dated the 24th November 1870. The supposed powers and privileges of the Council in London have been similarly dealt with, and the Council is now regarded merely as an adjunct of the office of the Secretary of State to furnish him with information or advice when he chooses to ask for it. The present position, then, is this: the Government in India has no power; the Council in London has no power; the House of Commons has the power, but it refuses or neglects to exercise it.

The 650 odd members who were to be the palladium of India's rights and liberties have thrown "the great and solemn trust of an inscrutable Providence" back upon the hands of Providence to be looked after as providence itself thinks best. (*Laughter.*) The affairs of India, especially in the Financial Department have passed with no kind of check whatever into the hands of the Secretary of State. I do not blame the present members of the House of Commons for thus abdicating the functions that their predecessors of thirty years ago assumed. The truth is, that they have not time enough to attend to the details of the trust; and on more important matters they can have only one side of every question—the official side—presented to them; and they know from experience that that is not always the whole of the case. (*Laughter.*) As they are not in a position to judge rightly, they do not attempt to judge at all; and they may fairly come to the conclusion that, if it is not worth our while to demand and agitate for some voice in our own affairs, it is not worth their while to trouble themselves at all about us. If we be satisfied, for example, to have the Budget thrown at our heads like a snow ball, and a muddy one it is, we deserve to have it in that way. There is a common belief among the European trading community that there are are some big leaks in the Store department and in Home charges generally; but we have no means for verifying or disproving the suspicion. Now and again we hear of some facts that confirm it. Here is one told me the other day by an authority I would call unimpeachable. The department with which this gentleman is connected indented for an article, and after many weary months it came at last charged six times the price for which, my informant said, he, himself, could have bought it. If we be content with the secrecy and the supposed inefficiency of such a system, then I say we deserve no better. Temporary commissions of enquiry into the working of such departments are of little good. The real remedy is a permanent commission in the shape of elected members of Council having the right to look into such matters. (*Cheers.*)

But when we make the demand that the political institutions of the country should be placed on a wider basis, we are not only asking what the Government of thirty years ago avowed was desirable, but also what almost every Viceroy since that time has either promised, or held out as a hope to be indulged in by us. I admit that these promises have been associated with such phrases as "when qualified" or "as far as may be." These words doubtless afford a pretext for shirking the due fulfilment of the promise. Of course, to the antagonistic mind, our qualification will always be in the future; but I am sure I express your conviction when I say that, whatever use the abettors of the present bureaucratic rule may make of these phrases, the distinguished personages who uttered them had far other intentions than to make of them a loop-hole of escape when all other channels of retreat were closed by a reasonable fulfilment of the conditions. Putting aside then this Small Cause Court use of the words (*laughter*), I come to say something on the question of qualification. What does it mean? What was in the minds of the Queen's advisers when these phrases were employed? Can we doubt that they

were thinking of the qualifications of ordinary English constituencies at a somewhat more rudimentary stage of their development than they are to-day? Now, if it can be shown that there are considerable numbers of people in this country with attainments and characteristics similar to those of constituencies in Great Britain two or three generations back, the condition as regards them has surely been amply fulfilled. But how is that to be shown? It is not a matter for mere floating opinion to decide, one man saying Yes, and the next saying No, but neither being able to adduce any reason, or state any fact in support of his view. If you want to know the financial resources of a body of men, such as a trading company, you audit their accounts. If you wish to ascertain where a village is in point of education, you don't inquire what Mr. This or Baboo That thinks, but you want to know how many schools there are, how many scholars there are, and what amount of money is being spent upon them. Then you have facts of a kind on which to form an intelligent and reliable judgment. Now, Gentlemen, in the Blue Books published by the Indian Government you have the material, the moral, and the educational state of the country set out in such fulness as to enable us to say where the people are in the scale of humanity as compared with those of other countries. I am not going into an "as dry-as-dust" analysis of these facts. I simply indicate the method of proof, and I challenge any one to rise from the study of these books, and give reasonable grounds for denying that there are large bodies of men in this country fitted in every way for the proper discharge of duties connected with a constitutional form of Government. One or two of the facts may be mentioned, however, to illustrate the nature of this evidence. The total foreign trade of India has reached the figure of £ 150,000,000 a year, which was the extent of the commerce of the United Kingdom in 1837. We are in precisely the same possession as regards commerce that England was in fifty years ago, and yet the mercantile community have not an authoritative word to say about the laws and regulations affecting such a prodigious trade. The income of the British Government in 1837 was £ 47,200,000, not one penny of which was raised or spent without the sanction of the representatives of the people. The Indian Budget of last year shows an income of £ 77,000,000, and there is not a man in the country outside the Supreme Council who has a vote or a voice in the matter. (*Loud cheers*). Since 1858, about £ 20,000,000 have been spent on educational institutions. The number of these institutions at the present time is 122,000, attended by upwards of 3,300,000 students. The number of schools in England in 1821 was only 18,467, and the scholars 650,000. These, however, have rapidly increased during the last twenty years, but it was not till 1881 that they reached the number of the schools and scholars in this country. Now a statesman or a politician would surely be justified in concluding that the country, of which such facts can be stated, must have within it considerable numbers of men of means, intelligence, industry, foresight and moral grit—the very material out of which good representative institutions can be carved. But there are other considerations that add weight to the testimony of the Blue Books. In all the

discussions that have taken place in Parliament about the inhabitants of India, there is one section which has never been thought of at all—I mean the British non-official class to which I belong. I want to make our existence known. We may be known as barristers and solicitors, as bankers, traders, merchants, engineers, editors of newspapers, manufacturers, planters and so forth, but the idea of citizenship, and all that that implies, never seems to have occurred to our rulers in connection with us. I know it has been said that we are already represented. We are English and the Government is English: therefore we are represented. But that is a false inference and a pure delusion. We have no more power and no more voice in the Government of the country than you Indians have. The Government is no more ours because it is administered by a Secretary of State who is an Englishman, than the bread in a baker's shop is ours because the shop happens to be kept by an Englishman and not by a Native. (*Laughter and cheers.*) We are all alike held to be on the same low level of unfitness and unripeness. The only thing we are the least bit of good for in the country, from the Governmental point of view, is to be taxed. (*Cheers.*) We are ripe enough for that; ripe enough to come under the sweep of the Board of Revenue sickle, but unripe for the meanest privileges of subjects of a free country. Our number is uncertain. The census tables do not inform us: but, few or many, almost all of us would be voters in England, and I venture to suggest that we would make a passable fraction of a constituency in this country. There is another consideration. There are many thousands of Hindu, Mahomedan, Eurasian, Parsee and other gentlemen in the country, who, if they were to transfer their persons to England for twelve months or more and pay certain rates, would be qualified to enjoy all the rights and privileges of British subjects. If you and I go to England we are qualified. If we return to India our character changes, and we are not qualified. In England we should be trusted citizens. In India, well, the charitably-minded among our opponents say that we are incipient traitors! (*Loud and prolonged cheers and laughter.*)

There is one more consideration. You know that the Government is accustomed to send some of the Bills it has in preparation to all our leading Associations, both Native and European, for the expression of our opinion upon their provisions. If we be qualified to give an opinion outside the Councils, how much more valuable would that opinion be with the fuller knowledge that can be obtained inside the Council?

I have thus far spoken of the qualification as having an intellectual as well as a material basis, but I may say here that the only qualification ever known to the British constitution has been the possession of a stake, as it is called, in the country. For four hundred years that stake was a forty-shillings freehold. At the present time it is the occupancy of a house and the payment of certain rates. An educational qualification may be implied in these later days, but it has never formed a test of fitness within the British dominions. But assuming it to be so, then, what I find is that India to-day, taking it all over, is in rather a better state in this respect than England was a century ago. At least every ninth man in India can read

and write. Now, I will read you a short extract from an excellent little book by Professor Thorold Rogers called the "British Citizen." He says, speaking of England: "I do not believe that 100 years ago more than one man in ten, or one woman in twenty, knew how to read and write. When I was a youth in a Hampshire village hardly one of the peasantry who was over forty years of age knew how to read. It was deemed superfluous to give even a rudimentary education to the peasant." Going another century or two back, the people of England, man and boy, high and low, with the exception of a mere handful were steeped in the grossest ignorance, and yet there was a House of Commons. But whatever may be deemed to be a proper qualification in England, or here, it is part of our own case that the great majority of the people is quite unfitted for the franchise. There we are at one with our opponents. But then they say that that is a good reason why the minority should wait until the mass be also qualified. There I think they are wrong. Granted that a man is not entitled to a vote any more than he is entitled to drive a steam-engine, and that is my own view of this question; but because the persons in a country capable of managing steam-engines are few compared with those who are not, are we, on that account, to debar the capable few from following their vocation? (*Cheers.*) In like manner, I contend that if there be but a small minority in a country fitted to exercise the useful function of the franchise, it is a mistake to withhold the privilege from them on the ground that others are not fitted. Given increasing means and growing intelligence, and there invariably follows a desire to have a voice in all matters that concern us; and I hope it is not difficult to believe that such a desire, "the monition of nature," as Carlyle calls it, "and much to be attended to," has been implanted in the human breast for some wise and good purpose. Happy would it be for the world if instead of thwarting and repressing such a desire, its rulers nourished it and guided it as it arose, into the proper channels for its due gratification and exercise. (*cheers*)

Now, the views and facts I have submitted would seem to warrant some important change in the polity of the country; but the change we do advocate is one of extreme moderation, and far within the limits that the circumstances of the country, in my own opinion, would justify. We don't seek to begin, as has been asserted, at the point England has reached after many generations of constitutional Government. We don't want the strong meat of full age, but we want to be weaned. We say there are numbers of us who have had the feeling bottle long enough. We desire no sudden snapping of existing ties; we ask only for the loosening of the bonds. We are content to regard ourselves as in the position of the man who has long been confined in a darkened room on account of disordered eyesight. We know that under the skilful treatment of a kindly physician our visual powers have been strengthened. We have sense enough not to demand the full blaze of day to be suddenly let in upon us, but only such a drawing-aside of the curtains as will adjust the light to our powers of vision. But, if the physician, skilful and kindly as we recognise him to be, were to insist upon our remaining in the dark, we should be forced to the unwelcome conclusion that his skill was

resultless and abortive, or that the unlovable side of his character had manifested itself in that he wished to keep us in the dark for some unworthy purpose of his own. If under such treatment we became discontented with his services, the blame of it would be with the physician and not with the patient. (*Cheers.*)

Now, Gentlemen, I will state more definitely the change we desire. We want the Legislative Councils to be expanded to an extent that will admit of the representation of the various interests in the country, as far as that may be practicable. We want half the Councils to be elected, the other half to be in the appointment of Government, and we are willing that the right of veto should be with the Executive. We also want the right of interpellation. These are the substance of our wants. We propose that the constituencies should consist of Members of Municipalities, Chambers of Commerce, Trades Associations; associations like the British Indian Association, and, generally, all persons possessing such qualifications, educational and pecuniary, as may be deemed necessary. We should have to go far back in the history of England to find a parallel to the limited privileges we should be content with,—to the time, at all events, of Edward the First, 600 years ago, when Barons and Commons sat together, and when King and Barons held the sway. We are not wedded even to these proposals. The principle of election frankly accepted, there would be little difficulty in satisfying us in the matter of the constituencies, or as to the size of the Councils. The devising of a suitable elective body might well be left to the Government, or better still, by way of a preliminary, to the final judgment of the Government, to a small Commission which could easily be rendered acceptable to the whole community. Happily there is no scarcity of men in the country, both among the official and non-official classes, abundantly qualified for such a work. I should like to mention the names of half-a-dozen such men chiefly for the purpose of dissipating the fears of those who seem to think we have some revolutionary scheme in view, and not because they only are competent for such an undertaking. If you were willing to commit the working-out of the practical details of the reform we ask for to the men I wish to name, we ought to hear the last of the reckless charges that are made against us. The first I have in my mind's eye is that wary, sagacious Scotchman who has just closed a long and honorable career of worthy service among us, Sir Charles Aitchison. The second is an Englishman, no less qualified by experience and by endowment of head and heart for the task, Sir Steuart Bayley. The next is the veteran statesman from the Southern Provinces, Sir Madhava Rao. The next is a Mahomedan of tried legislative ability from the Bombay side of the peninsula, Budrudin Tyabjee. The next is a gentleman from Bengal whose character and talents have placed him in the front rank of his profession, W. C. Bonnerjee. These five men presided over, and the balance held even between them, by such an one as the Governor of Bombay or Madras would, I believe, produce a scheme which would secure the approval of the Government, allay the fears of the timid, and satisfy the aspiring ones among us for a generation at least. (*Loud cheers.*)

I fear I have occupied your time to an unreasonable length, but I wish to trespass on your indulgence for a short time longer for the purpose of making a few remarks on the speech of the ex-Viceroy at the Scotch Dinner in Calcutta. All movements of the kind in which we are concerned pass through several phases as they run their course. The first is one of ridicule. That is followed, as the movement progress, by one of abuse, which is usually succeeded by partial concession and misapprehension of aim, accompanied by warnings against taking "big jumps into the unknown." The final stage of all is a substantial adoption of the object of the movement with some expression of surprise that it was not adopted before. These various phases overlap each other, but between the first and last the distinction is complete.

Well, we are out and away from the comical aspect of the movement. It has become too serious for that, and we are midway between the abusive and misapprehensive stages. In the speech of our ex-Viceroy we have, as might be expected, none of the coarser instruments of attack—indeed, I find a vein of sympathy with us running through his speech—and we have partial concession, misapprehension regarding some of our demands, and, in consequence, the usual warning voice. The concession I refer to is as regards the separation of the Executive and Judicial functions. This was one of the ridiculous proposals, one of those school-boy clamours to start with, but the Viceroy now tells us that "this is a counsel of perfection to which we are ready to subscribe." Allow me to congratulate you upon this concession so frankly and handsomely made. All that we want now is to see the concession of the principle reduced into practice. ("*Hear, hear.*") The misapprehension is contained in the following sentence: "The ideal authoritatively suggested, as I understand, is the creation of a representative body or bodies, in which the official element shall be in a minority, who shall have what is called the power of the purse, and who through this instrumentality shall be able to bring the British Executive into subjection to their will." Now, Gentlemen, if there be one thing more than another that we have tried to make clear, it is that the British Executive should continue to be paramount in the Councils. We have made it as clear as the English language is capable of expressing thought, that the utmost we want is that half of the Councils be elected ; the other half to be wholly in the nomination of the Government. These may be all officials or not, just as the Government pleases, and we have made it equally clear, in addition, that the Government should have the right to veto all adverse votes. Such an arrangement guarantees the supremacy of the Executive under all circumstances, aye, even if their own side vote against them. But, is it to be assumed that the elected members are all to vote adversely ? Is it to be supposed that any measure of the Executive will be such as to be condemned by every section of the community ? I hope no British Executive will ever take leaps into the dark to lead to such a result. Well, the Viceroy having started upon an assumption that is not only incorrect, but is the very opposite of the fact, it follows that his condemnation does not apply to us at all,

but to a fanciful piece of workmanship of which we are not the artists. The Viceroy must necessarily depend largely upon his subordinates for correct information about the details of this and other movements, and it looks to me as if one of those compilers of facts had fallen into some grievous error. The authoritative views of the Congress are to be found in its resolutions, and the resolution about the reform of the Councils is the third one of the first meeting of the Congress three years ago, and that resolution has been the one affirmed at the following meetings. We are in no way bound even by any statement or argument that any speaker may make in supporting that resolution; but I say with the greatest confidence that, neither in the resolution itself, nor in the speeches of the gentlemen supporting it, is a word to be found that justifies the "ideal authoritatively suggested." There may be some remarks in letters to newspapers, in pamphlets, or in speeches made by members of the Congress that give support to the "ideal." I don't know of them, and if I did, I should regret them, just as I might regret any of our members having a hump back; but I should feel no responsibility for either his back or speech. If we be charged with encouraging "ideals" on such grounds, we may as logically be charged, in the other event, as a Congress for promoting deformed spines! (*"Hear, hear," and laughter.*) It is annoying to us no doubt, that our friends, as I take Lord Dufferin to be, should be deceived by imitations of our ticket; but as we have no Trade Mark Bill to protect our wares, all that we can do is to warn our friends to ask for the real article and see that they get it. *(Loud and continued cheers.)*

And now, Gentlemen, I wish to say, in conclusion, that I have a strong faith that our limited enfranchisement is in the near and not in the distant future. No rational mind can believe that the present system can go on for ever,—that it is the last will and dying testament of Providence regarding us. (*Laughter.*) We are, I trust the heirs of a better hope. A careful reading of the speeches and writings of our leading officials leads me to believe that they would be glad to see this matter settled; and I do not exclude Sir Auckland Colvin from this category. His objection seems to be to some of the bye-play and not to the general drift of the drama. The great difficulty hitherto has been to find the time to deal with the subject. Lord Dufferin had his thoughts too fully occupied with the troubles on the frontier and in Burmah to give adequate attention to this question, which is apparent in the mistake he has fallen into regarding our demands. And I for one regret that it has not fallen to his lot to add a new lustre to his name, and to establish a further claim upon our regard by promoting a measure such as we advocate,—a measure which any statesman might well be proud to be the instrument of carrying; for it is one which (while going a long way, if not the whole way, in calming the present agitation) would draw into closer connection the two extreme branches of the Aryan race, the common subjects of the Queen-Empress: a measure which would unite England and India, not by the hard and brittle bonds of arbitrary rule which may snap in a moment, but by the flexible and more enduring ligaments of common interests promoted, common duties discharged, by

means of a common service, chosen with some regard to the principles of representative Government.

Fifth Congress—Bombay—1889.

Sir William Wedderburn.

I thank you, gentlemen, from the bottom of my heart, for the great honor you have conferred upon me. I beg leave also to offer my acknowldgements to the mover, the seconder and the supporter of this resolution for the gracious terms in which they have referred to my past connection with India. After our long acquaintance it seems hardly necessary that I should assure you of my feelings of good-will towards the people of India. *(Cheers.)* But I will mention this one fact, that I have passed a quarter of a century among you, and during that period of time I have not known what it was to suffer an unkindness from a native of India. During that period I have been in the service of the people of India, and have eaten their salt. *(Loud and continued cheering.)* And I hope to devote to their service what still remains to me of active life. I take this chair to-day with much pleasure and pride. It warms my heart to receive this mark of confidence from the Indian people. And I rejoice to take part in a movement so well calculated to promote the best interests of India and of England. *(Cheers.)*

I have watched from its commencement the movement which has now culminated in the Indian National Congress. And in my humble judgment the movement is unmitigated good, in its origin, objects, and its methods. As regards its historical origin, we know that it is the direct result of the noblest efforts of British statesmanship: the natural and healthy fruit of higher education and free institutions freely granted to the people of India. Again, what are the practical objects of the Congress movement? They are to revive the National life, and to increase the material prosperity of the country; and what better object could we have before us? Lastly as regards our methods, they are open and constitutional, and based solely on India's reliance upon British justice and love of fair-play. Looking back to the history of the movement, there was one critical time in its development: that was about ten years ago. The leaven was then actually at work, though the purpose of the movement was not then so well defined, and it was unwisely sought to deal with it by a policy of repression. The results might have been disastrous. But happily that time of tribulation was cut short by the

arrival of the greatest and best of all our Viceroys, the Marquis of Ripon. (*Loud cheers.*) By his wise and sympathetic policy Lord Ripon met and fulfilled the aspirations of the national movement. And on their side the people of India recognised that a government conducted in such a spirit could not be regarded as an alien rule. This was the meaning of the passionate demonstrations at the time of Lord Ripon's departure. You, gentlemen, will correct me if I am wrong in saying that those demonstrations were a popular declaration that on such terms British rule could be accepted as the national Government of the Indian people. (*Long and enthusiastic cheers.*)

But, gentlemen, you know all this as well as I do, and better. I think what you want to hear from me is not so much about your affairs in India as about your affairs in England. I have been nearly three years away from you, and have been studying English politics with special reference to Indian interests. And you would like to know what are the results. You will naturally ask me, what are the prospects of the Congress movement in England? What are the obstacles which we have to overcome? And what are the practical objects to which our activity can best be directed? To these inquiries I would reply generally that our hopes depend entirely upon the degree to which the British people can be induced to exert their power with reference to India. Our one great ultimate question is that of a Parliamentary control over Indian affairs. If that can be obtained, all will be well. The case of India in England is really a simple one. The Crown and Parliament of Great Britain have laid down certain broad and liberal principles for the administration of India, and have solemnly pledged themselves that these shall be acted on. With those principles the people of India are fully satisfied. But the difficulty is in the practice. For owing to the necessity of the case the actual administration has to be entrusted to official agents in India. And the problem is, how under the circumstances can an effectual control be exercised from England so as to ensure these principles being carried out and these pledges fulfilled? Unfortunately there is one very serious fact which much enhances the difficulty of this problem, and it is this, that in certain important particulars the professional interests of our official administrators in India are in antagonism with the interests of the Indian tax-payer whose affairs they administer. This is a somewhat delicate matter, but it is an important one, and I feel it my duty to speak out clearly. Perhaps also it is easier for me than for most people to speak freely regarding the Indian officia class, and that for two reasons. First, because I am deeply interested personally in the honor of that class. (*Hear, hear.*) The Indian Civil Service has been a sort of hereditary calling in our family since the beginning of the century. My father entered the Civil Service in 1807; and my eldest brother followed him, until he lost his life in the Bengal mutinies. I came out shortly afterwards so that we are identified with what may be called the Indian official caste. The other reason is, because my complaint is against the system; not against the men who carry it out. On the contrary, it is my deliberate belief that the Indian Civil and Military services have never been surpassed

for honest hard work and unselfish devotion to duty. (*Cheers.*) Such being the case, I have no hesitation in repeating that the interests of the Indian services are in great measure antagonistic to the interests of the Indian tax-payer. The main interests of the Indian tax-payer are peace, economy and reform. But all those are necessarily distasteful to the civil and military classes. A spirited and well-equipped army naturally desires, not peace, but active service. And who can reasonably expect officials to love economy, which means reduction of their own salaries; or reform, which means restriction of their authority? (*Cheers and laughter.*) It cannot be expected that as a class our official administrators in India will work for peace, economy and reform. But this very fact makes all the more urgent the necessity for a control in England which shall be both vigilant and effectual. We have therefore now to see what is the state of that control. Is it strong, vigilant, and effectual? I am sorry to say that the answer to this question is highly unsatisfactory. A brief historical review will, I fear, show that, in the matter of Parliamentary control, things have gone from bad to worse, until they are now about as bad as can be. It is now more than a hundred years ago since Edmund Burke (*cheers*) pointed out the crying need for a strong impartial control in England over Indian affairs. And Mr. Fox's India Bill would have provided an organized machinery for exercising this control. But unhappily, owing to party struggles unconnected with India, this bill fell through, "India's Magna Charta," as Burke called it, and never since has a similar attempt been made. But although no remedy was then applied, things were not so bad until the passing of the Government of India Act in 1858, which transferred the Government from the Company to the Crown. It is from that Act that I date our principal misfortunes. Till then we had two important safe-guards. The first was the wholesome jealousy felt by Parliament towards the East India Company as a privileged Corporation. The other was the necessity for the renewal of the Company's charter at the end of every 30 years. At each of those renewals the Company's official administration had to justify its existence; there was a searching inquiry into grievances: and there never was a renewal without the grant to the public of important reforms and concessions suited to the progressive condition of Indian affairs. (*Cheers.*) Now unfortunately both those safe-guards are lost. The official administrators, who used to be viewed with jealousy, have now been admitted into the innermost sanctum of authority; and, as Council to the Secretary of State, form a secret Court of appeal for the hearing of all Indian complaints. They first decide all matters in India, and then retire to the Indian Council at Westminister to sit in appeal on their own decisions. Such a method of control is a mockery, a snare and a delusion. This evil is very far reaching, for when a decision is passed at the India Office the Secretary of State becomes committed to it, so that if an independent member tries to take up the case in the House of Commons, he finds himself confronted, not by a discredited company, but by the full power of the Treasury Bench. But the loss of the periodical inquiry once at least in 30 years, is perhaps a still more serious disaster.

There is now no day of reckoning. And Indian reformers find all their efforts exhausted in the vain attempt to obtain a Parliamentary inquiry, such as was before provided, without demand and without effort. At the present moment such an inquiry is much over due. The last periodical inquiry was held in 1854, so that under the old system a Parliamentary inquiry would have been begun five years ago. But although such an inquiry has been constantly asked for, and has been promised, it has never been granted. No doubt, we shall manage to get it in the end, but it will be at the cost of much wasted energy.

I think, gentlemen, I have shown that the last state of our control is worse than the first. On the one hand, we have been deprived of our periodical inquiry into grievances, while on the other hand, all complaints are calmly referred for disposal to the very officials against whom the complaints are made. (*Hear, hear.*) I should like, by way of illustration, to give a couple of instances to show how this system works in practice. The first case I will take is that which was well-known, at the time, as the Break of Gauge controversy. In that matter General Strachey, as Public Works member of the Viceroy's Council, held his own against the whole united public opinion of India, European and Native, official and un-official; and the railway gauge was fixed in the way he wished it. Later on, the question came in appeal to the Secretary of State. But by that time General Strachey had retired from his position in India, and had been appointed to the Indian Council (*laughter*), where he was the official adviser of the Secretary of State in matters relative to railways and public works. When therefore the public fancied they were appealing from the Government of India to the Secretary of State, they were really enjoying an appeal from General Strachey to himself. (*Laughter.*) This instance shows how the system of the Indian Council is even worse in fact than in theory. One might perhaps suppose that there being 15 members of the Council, one's grievance might come before those not personally affected. But such is not the case. Each member is considered as an expert as regards his particular province or department, and is allowed to ride his own hobby, provided he allows his colleagues also to ride their own hobbies in the way they choose. The other instance is taken from my own experience, and has reference to Agricultural Banks. We cherish the idea that if he had fair play, the Ryot might develop into a substantial Yeoman instead of being the starveling he is. With a fertile soil, a glorious sun, and abundance of highly skilled labour, there is no reason why India should not become a garden if the Ryot were not crushed by his debts. The only thing that is required is capital, in order to settle these old debts and make advances to the Ryots on reasonable terms, so that they may be supplied with water for irrigation and manure. As you know, we prepared a practical scheme, founded on the German system of peasant Banks, and got all the parties concerned to agree to it. The Bombay Government approved of the experiment, which was to be on a very limited scale; and the scheme was forwarded for sanction to the Secretary of State by Lord Ripon's Government, Sir Evelyn Baring as Finance Minister having agreed to advance 5 lakhs of

rupees for the settlement of the old debts. In England the scheme was well received. Mr. John Bright took the chair at a meeting in Exeter Hall in furtherance of the project, and each of the leading London daily papers expressed approval. The Manchester Chamber of Commerce also memorialized the Secretary of State in its favor. Well, gentlemen, this scheme entered the portals of the India Office, and never left it alive. ("*Shame!*") It was stabbed in the dark, no one knows by what hand or for what reason. Not long ago our friend Mr. Samuel Smith asked a question about it in the House of Commons; he inquired why the experiment recommended by Lord Ripon's Government was not allowed; and he was informed by Sir John Gorst that the scheme was not considered "practicable." Not practicable indeed! I wonder whether Sir J. Gorst is aware that in Germany alone there are 2,000 such Agricultural Banks in active working, and that throughout the continent of Europe it is admitted that without such financial institutions the peasant proprietor is absolutely unable to maintain himself without falling into the clutches of the village usurer. I think I may say with confidence that the India Office has not yet heard the last word on the subject of Agricultural Banks in India. (*Cheers.*)

I fear, therefore, that in reviewing the situation in England, we must admit that the organized forces are in the hands of our opponents. The India Office is strong against us, together with the influence of the services and of society. The London Press is not favourable to us. And those members of Parliament who have Indian experience rank themselves mostly on the official side. On the other hand, we need not lose hope; for the spirit of the age is on our side. The forces of the new democracy are in favour of national aspirations; and wherever meetings of working men are addressed they are found willing, nay, eager, that justice should be done to India. (*Cheers.*) My friend has referred to the constituency of North Ayrshire which has been good enough on the liberal side to choose me as its candidate; and he hoped that my invitation to come out here would not in any way damage my chances. I am very glad to assure you that so far from damaging my chances it has very much raised me in their estimation. *(Loud cheers.)* As soon as my supporters in North Ayrshire learned that I had been invited to preside at this Congress, they were highly gratified, and resolutions were passed expressing strong sympathy with the Indian people. Nor is it on the liberal side only that India has active sympathisers. She has many good friends among Conservatives; and to those I think we may reasonably appeal in the matter of parliamentary control over Indian affairs. It is sometimes said that conservatives walk in the footsteps of good reformers; that is, they stand now in the position that good reformers stood in perhaps 50 years ago. If this is so, we may well ask their help to carry through the reforms that commended themselves to Burke and to Fox; and still more to restore that 30 years periodical inquiry which was originally secured to us by the wisdom of our ancestors. (*Cheers.*)

And if the older organizations are against us, we have younger organizations which are making good and healthy growth. First and foremost, the Indian

National Congress, is becoming a household word in England; and it will become a power in the State, if you continue patient, persistent, moderate. Then again, you have done well and wisely to establish organization No. 2, a Congress Agency in London. In the Indian National Congress the people of India, hitherto dumb, have found a voice. But the distance to England is great, and the agency is needed, like a telephone, to carry the voice of the people of India to the ear of the people of England. It seems to me that the agency, under your indefatigable Secretary, Mr. William Digby (*Loud cheers*), is simply invaluable in bringing India in contact with her friends in England, and in briefing those friends when they take up Indian subjects either in Parliament or before the public. Also the agency, with the Committee which supervises its working, will, we hope, be the nucleus round which an Indian party will gradually gather itself. This will be our organization No. 3, the Indian Parliamentary party, consisting of men who, however different their views may be on other subjects, are willing to co-operate on the basis of a just and sympathetic policy towards India. The meeting three weeks ago, at the National Liberal Club, under the presidency of our valued friend Mr. George Yule, was the first movement towards the formation of such a party. Strong sympathy was then expressed with the objects of the Congress: and it is hoped that when Parliament meets arrangements will be made to secure joint action in matters affecting Indian interests. But, gentlemen, I have not come to the end of our list of activities on behalf of India. I rejoice to learn that a group of Indian speakers of weight and experience are about to proceed to England, in company with our General Secretary (*Loud cheers*) for the purpose of initiating a systematic propaganda by addressing popular audiences at the great centres of population throughout Great Britain. You will know well how to address those great audiences, appealing fearlessly to the highest motives, and calling on the people of England to perform their trust and duty towards the unrepresented millions of India: appeals to unselfishness, to justice, and to humanity will ever find a sure response from the great heart of the British people. (*Cheers.*)

In conclusion, I would like to address a few words to those of our English friends who distrust the Congress movement. The promoters of the Congress profess strong attachment to British rule. And I would ask, is there any reason to doubt this profession? ("*No, no.*") Have those men any interests antagonistic to our rule? ("*No, no.*") Remember that the originators of this movement are educated men, trained up by us in a love of freedom and free institutions. Is it likely that these men should wish to exchange the rule of England, the freest and the most enlightened country in the world, for that of Russia which is one of the most barbarous and retrograde? (*Cheers.*) I remember being much struck with the remark of a native friend of mine with reference to Russian advances. He said to me, "If India is lost we are the chief losers, you can go to your ships and will be safe in your distant homes. We, on the other hand, should lose all: our country, our liberties, and our hopes for the regeneration of our race." Perhaps some of our doubting English friends will say, "We attach more importance to

deeds than to words." I think we can point also to deeds. It is well known that in all schemes for the invasion of India the Russian Generals depend for success on a hoped-for rising of the native population. In 1885 they appear to have put this idea to the test by a pretended advance. Had this move been followed by any signs of sympathy, or even by an ominous silence of expectancy throughout India, Russia would have rejoiced, and we should have felt our position weakened. But India does not treat England's difficulty as her opportunity. On the contrary, there went up on all sides a patriotic cry, led by the native press, calling on all to join with men and money, and make common cause against the common foe. (*Cheers.*) I think also the action of the Congress when calmly viewed, will be seen to point in the same direction. The man who points out the rocks and shoals towards which the ship is moving, is the friend of the captain, not the enemy. And that is the light in which the government should regard the criticisms of the Congress. The moderate reforms proposed by the Congress will all tend to make the people of India more prosperous and more contented, and will thereby strengthen the foundations of British rule. (*Cheers.*) And here I would specially invite our English commercial friends to join with us in our efforts to increase the material prosperity of the country. At present owing to the poverty of the people the trade is nothing in comparison with what it ought to be. This is an argument which has been effectively pressed by our veteran leader Dadabhai Naoroji. He has pointed out that our Australian Colonies take English goods at the rate of £17 or £18 per head per annum, whereas poor India can only take at the rate of eighteen pence a head. If, by releasing him from his bonds of debt, and placing him in a position to exercise his industry, we could make the Ryot moderately prosperous, how great would be the benefit to English trade! If the Indian customer could take even £1 a head, the exports to India would exceed the exports to all the rest of the world put together. I would therefore say to our mercantile friends, help us to make the ryot prosperous, and your commercial business will soon increase by leaps and bounds.

Gentlemen, I have now concluded my preliminary remarks, and I thank you for the patience with which you have heard me, and have now to invite you to attack, with good appetite, the substantial bill of fare which will be placed before you. I will not in any way anticipate your proceedings, but I may perhaps express a hope that you will give early and earnest attention to the Bill for the Reform of the Legislative Council. And in connection with this Bill I would take the opportunity to congratulate you on the presence here to-day of a very distinguished visitor—one whose name is a synonym for independence, for strength, and for success. I think poor India is very fortunate in securing such a champion as Mr. Charles Bradlaugh (*Loud and continued cheers*), a very Charles Martel of these later days, whose sledge-hammer blows have often shaken to their foundations the citadels of prejudice, of ignorance and of oppression.

To-day there only remains to appoint, as usual, a Subjects Committee, and I will ask you to do this before we separate.

Gentlemen, I will not detain you longer, but will only express my earnest hope that your labors may prosper, and that your deliberations may effectually promote "the safety, honor and welfare of Her Majesty and her dominions." (*Loud and long continued cheers, followed by a general rising and waving of handkerchiefs and a final "One cheer more!"*).

Sixth Congress—Calcutta—1890.

Mr. Pherozshah Mehta.

Ladies and Gentlemen,—I beg to tender to you my most sincere thanks for the honor you have done me in calling me to preside over your deliberations this year. I cannot imagine a greater honor for a native of this country than to be elected, by your free and spontaneous suffrages, President of an assembly which is now one of the recognized institutions of the country—an unconventional Convention of the Empire which we may say without undue ostentation, has already earned a place in history,—not less surely, let us trust, than the famous St. Andrews Dinners of the city,—as making an epoch in the march of events moulding the lofty destinies of the magnificent land. In speaking of myself as a native of this country, I am not unaware that, incredible as it may seem, Parsis have been both called, and invited and allured to call themselves, foreigners. If twelve centuries; however entitle Angles and Saxons, and Normans and Danes, to call themselves natives of England, if a lesser period entitles the Indian Mahomedans to call themselves natives of India, surely we are born children of the soil, in which our lot has been cast for a period of over thirteen centuries, and where ever since the advent of the British power, we have lived and worked, with our Hindu and Mahomedan neighbours, for common aims, common aspirations, and common interests. To my mind, a Parsi is a better and a truer Parsi, as a Mahomedan or a Hindu is a better and truer Mahomedan or Hindu; the more he is attached to the land which gave him birth, the more he is bound in brotherly relations and affection to all the children of the soil, the more he recognizes the fraternity of all the native communities of the country, and the immutable bond which binds them together in the pursuit of common aims and objects under a common Government. Is it possible to imagine that Dadabhai Naorojee, for instance, true Parsi that he is, is anything but an Indian, living and working all his life for all India, with the true and tender loyalty of a son? Can any one doubt, if I may be

allowed to take another illustration, that Sir Syed Ahmed Khan was greater and nobler when he was devoting the great energies and talents with which he is endowed,—if, for the benefit of Mahomedans in particular,—for the benefit of all Indians in general, than when, as of late, he was preaching a gospel of selfishness and isolation? The birthright, therefore, gentlemen, which the Parsis thus possess of so indefeasible and glorious a character, they have refused and will always refuse to sell for any mess of pottage, however fragrant and tempting. *(Loud cheers).* More especially, therefore, as an Indian it is that I return to you my grateful thanks for the honor you have done me.

I have ventured, Gentlemen, to ascribe to the Congress the credit of making an epoch in Indian political progress. A very brief survey of the incidents of the twelve months that have elapsed since we last met will amply justify our title to that distinction. In the admirable address which was delivered by my predecessor in this chair at Allahabad, Mr. Yule pointed out that all movements of the kind in which we are concerned pass through several phases as they run their course. The first is one of ridicule. That is followed, as the movement progresses, by one of abuse, which is usually succeeded by partial concession, and misapprehension of aim, accompanied by warnings against taking big jumps into the unknown. The final stage of all is a substantial adoption of the object of the movement, with some expression of surprise that it was not adopted before. Well, Gentlemen, we have pretty well passed the first two stages. We have survived the ridicule, the abuse, and the misrepresentation. We have survived the charge of sedition and disloyalty. We have survived the charge of being a microscopic minority. We have also survived the charge of being guilty of the atrocious crime of being educated, and we have even managed to survive the grievous charge of being all Babus in disguise. *(Laughter and cheers).*

The question of our loyalty is set at rest for ever. In the debate on Lord Cross's India Reform Bill in the House of Lords, Viceroy after Viceroy bore emphatic testimony to the loyal and peaceful character of our aims and efforts. Within the last few days the voice of no less a personage than one of our former Secretaries of State has confirmed this testimony. Lord R. Churchill—it is to no less distinguished a public man that I refer—has publicly declared that "he could sincerely remark that no one will rejoice more than himself if the deliberations of the Indian National Congress shortly to be resumed were to contribute effectually to the progress and the welfare of the Indian people." Then, Gentlemen, it is made clear that we have not learnt the lessons of history so badly, as to demand the introduction of the full-blown representative institutions which, in England, have been the growth of centuries. It is made clear that we have not asked for even such a modicum, as was enjoyed by the English people even before the time of Simon de Montfort, more than five centuries ago, nay, that we have not asked even for representative institutions of a governing or ruling character at all. Indeed, so far as this historical argument is concerned, we have not alone proved that we have *not* been guilty of disregarding it, but we have been successful in

turning the tables upon our adversaries. We have shown that it is they who defy the lessons of history and experience when they talk of waiting to make a beginning, till the masses of the people are fully equipped with all the virtues and all the qualifications which adorn the citizens of Utopia, in fact, till a millennium has set in, when we should hardly require such institutions at all. We have shown that people who indulge in such vain talk have never understood the laws of human progress, which, after all, is a series of experiments, in which men and institutions re-act upon each other for their mutual improvement and perfection. We have also proved that, in spite of our education, and even with our racial and religious differences, the microscopic minority can far better and far more intuitively represent the needs and the aspirations of their own countrymen than the still more microscopic minority of the omniscient District Officers, whose colloquial knowledge of the Indian languages seldom rises above the knowledge of English possessed, for instance, by French waiters at Paris Hotels which proudly blazon forth the legend—'Ici on parle Anglais ;' and whose knowledge of native domestic and social life and ways and habits of thought seldom extends beyond a familiarity with flattering expressions of the Saheb's greatness and paternal care, sometimes inspired by courtesy and sometimes by interest. An amusing story was related to me of a little incident that occurred only the other day which is not without instruction as illustrating the amount of knowledge possessed by Anglo-Indians of the people among whom they have moved for years. The wife of a member of Parliament, who has come out on a visit to India this year—herself as distinguished as her husband for her kindly sympathy in Indian welfare—was sitting at dinner next to a learned member of my profession, who, in the course of conversation, grew humorous and sarcastic by turns, in the fashion of M. Rudyard Kipling, on the ridiculous and outrageous pretensions of globe-trotters to know the country and its people better than Anglo-Indians who had lived in it for years. He was rattling away, well satisfied with himself and the impression he thought he was producing on the lady, when, with the sweetest of smiles, she gently asked him how long he had been himself in India. Fifteen years—more or less—was the answer. I suppose you know well Mr.—— naming a gentleman whose recent elevation to the Bench of one of our High Courts was received everywhere with pleasure and approbation. Of course, I do, said his brother in the same profession. Can you tell me if he has only one wife or more than one? Slowly came the answer, No I fear I can't. Well I can tell *you* ; you see I have been only a few days in the country, said the lady quietly, and yet I think I know a thing or two which you don't. I trust my learned friend, who is the hero of this story, was properly grateful to the lady for giving him some serious food for reflection.

Then, Gentlemen, our right to the designation of a National body has been vindicated. It is so admirably set forth in an article which appeared in a Conservative Review—*The National*—from the pen of a Conservative who, however, speaks from the fulness of intimate knowledge, that I cannot resist the temptation of borrowing from it. "The supposed rivalry," says the writer, "between Mussulmans

and Hindus is a convenient decoy to distract attention and to defer the day of reform. I do not wish to affirm that there is no antagonism between the adherents of the two faiths; but I do most positively assert that the antagonism has been grossly exaggerated. Every municipal improvement and charitable work finds members of the two faiths working together and subscribing funds to carry it out. Every political paper in the country finds supporters from believers in both creeds. Just the same is witnessed in the proceedings of the Congress. The members of the Congress met together as men, on the common basis of nationality, being citizens of one country, subjects of one power, amenable to one code of laws, taxed by one authority, influenced for weal or woe by one system of administration, urged by like impulses to secure like rights and to be relieved of like burdens. If these are not sufficient causes to weld a people together into one common alliance of nationality, it is difficult to conceive what would be sufficient. It is for this reason the organization has been called the Indian National Congress; not because, as many besides Mr. Keane, have assumed, that it claims a non-existent unity of race, but because it deals with rights and interests which are national in character, and matters in which all the inhabitants of the Indian peninsula are equally concerned.'

I think we may take it, Gentlemen, that we have passed through the first two stages, and that the loyalty, the moderation, the propriety, and the constitutional and national character of our mission are now established beyond a doubt. But, however arduous and however provoking some of the experiences of the trial through which we have passed, they should not leave any trace of bitterness behind. For let us not imagine that they were devoid of chastening and beneficial effects upon ourselves. Let us frankly acknowledge that they also must have had their share in contributing to add clearness to our thoughts, sobriety to our methods, and moderation to our proposals. If I might use a proscribed, but not unscriptural phrase we must give even the devil, his due. (*Laughter*).

It is on the third stage—the era of achievement—that we have now entered. It is true that a majority of the Congress proposals do not still seem to have made much headway. Even as regards the proposal to separate the Executive and the Judicial functions, lauded by Lord Dufferin "as a counsel of perfection to which the Government were ready to subscribe," Government are yet so absorbed in admiration of it that they have not recovered themselves sufficiently to take action. There is, however, no reason to despair. It was once proved upon sworn testimony in the Bombay High Court, before the late Chief Justice Sir M. Westropp that a woman required 22 months for parturition in the air of the province of Kattyawar. It is not impossible, Gentlemen, that the air of Simla may similarly necessitate a more than ordinarily long period of gestation to perfect even counsels of perfection; and therefore we must possess our souls in more than ordinary patience, lest any precipitate pressure might occasion a miscarriage. (*Laughter*). In one little matter, complete success has attended our efforts, *viz.*, as regards the duty on silver-plate. The Abkari cause is also safe in the custody of that redoubtable champion, of whose formidable prowess you can form some idea, when you remember that it

was he who so completely put to rout Mr. Goschen's Compensation clauses. It is a matter of no small congratulation to us to welcome Mr. Caine as one of our own Delegates. He first came out to this country with a free and open mind on the Congress question; with that fearless independence which characterizes him, and which always when I see him recalls to my mind those famous lines of Burns—"The man of independent mind is king of men for a' that," he went for his education to Aligarh. Thanks to Mr. Th. Beck and Sir Syed Ahmed, he has come to us, not only a staunch Congressman in principles, but, as one of the Indian Political Agency, he has thrown his indomitable energy and his high-souled advocacy into active support of the movement. Mr. Caine can truly boast that, if he has not succeeded in extorting from Mr. Pritchard and all the most zealous Abkari officers the confession that they are Bacchus and his crew in disguise, they dare not, at least, throw off their masks while his watchful eye is upon them, but must continue to do penance in the assumed garb of uncomfortable and uncongenial principles. Leaving Christian to continue his combat with Apollyon, it is when we come to the central proposal of the Congress regarding the Legislative Councils, for the purpose of expanding and putting life in them, that we can congratulate ourselves on being on the verge of an important step. Many have been the circumstances, and many the forces and influences, that have contributed to this result. First and foremost among them is the circumstance that, without legal votes and legal qualifications, we have had the good fortune to become possessed of a member of our own in Parliament. Do not imagine, Gentlemen, that Dadabhai Naoroji or Lalmohan Ghose has at length been returned. But what member, even if we had the direct franchise, could have served us as Mr. Bradlaugh has done during the last twelve months? To say that the whole country is grateful to him for the untiring energy, the indefatigable care, the remarkable ability with which he has watched and worked for its best interests in that House, where he has achieved so honorable a position for himself, can only most imperfectly express the depth and extent of the sentiments that are felt for him throughout the length and breadth of the land. His name has literally become a household word. He is raising up to himself a memorial in the hearts of the people of India, which will reflect more lustre on his name than titles and orders, and endure longer than monuments of brass or marble. (*Loud cheers.*)

We have been fortunate indeed in securing the sympathies of such a champion. No sooner did he return to England than he at once proceeded to redeem the promise he had made on that behalf, by introducing in the House of Commons his India Councils Reform Bill, drawn on the lines which were sketched and formulated at the last Congress, and with which you are all familiar under its justly deserved brief designation of the Madras Scheme. Two important results were the immediate outcome of this step. The scheme which was thus propounded was in its nature a tentative measure, so far as its details were concerned; and it at once drew forth useful and guiding criticism. In several respects its scope was misunderstood, especially as regards its supposed sweeping character which might

have been avoided, had we specified in the Congress skeleton sketch the restrictive limitations hedging the qualifications of the electorate. The criticisms of men like Sir W. Hunter and Sir R. Garth, for whose thoughtful, sympathetic and friendly attitude towards Indian progress we are always so deeply grateful, exposed, however, one defect demanding serious consideration, *viz.*, that the scheme was laid on new lines, and had a somewhat theoretical air, which Englishmen rather fight shy of in practical politics. In justice to the scheme, however, it should be said that Sir Richard Garth put his finger on a possible, rather than a probable, result when he thought that it would enable the Hindus to submerge the other Indian communities. Experience has shown that even in a preponderating Hindu electorate it does not happen that Hindus only are elected, as so many other, besides racial, forces and interests concur in influencing the selection. If we may apply the lessons learnt from experience in municipal elections, I may mention the remarkable fact that in the Town Council or, what is now called the Standing Committee of the Bombay Corporation, composed of 12 members, there have been frequently 5 Parsis, 3 Europeans, 2 Hindus and 2 Mahomedans. Sir R. Garth's criticism on this point, however, throws out a warning which should not be hastily disregarded.

But the next result, which the introduction of Mr. Bradlaugh's bill achieved, was gratifying in the highest degree. It at once dispelled the fit of profound cogitation, in which men at the head of Indian affairs are so apt to be lost, that they can never spontaneously recover from it. Lord Cross's Indian Council's Bill promptly saw the light of day in the House of Lords. It was at once the official recognition of the *raison-d-être* of the Congress, and the first fruits of its labours. In itself, however, it was a most halting and unsatisfactory measure. In framing it, the Prime Minister and the Indian Secretary of State, seem to have been pervaded with a conception of the Indian people as a sort of Oliver Twist, always asking for more, to whom it would be therefore a piece of prudent policy to begin with offering as little as possible. The Government Bill may be aptly described as a most superb steam-engine in which the necessary material to generate steam was carefully excluded, substituting in its place colored shams to look like it. The rights of interpellation and of the discussion of the Budget were granted, but the living forces of the elective principle, which alone could properly work them, were not breathed into the organization of the enlarged councils. The omission of the elective principle from the bill was boldly justified by Lord Salisbury on the ground that "the principle of election or government by representation was not an Eastern idea, and that it did not fit Eastern traditions or Eastern minds." I wish to speak of his Lordship with all the respect to which his high talents and great intellectual attainments justly entitle him; but it is not a little surprising as well as disappointing to find the Prime Minister of England, a statesman who, as Lord Cranborne, was once Secretary of State for India, displaying such profound ignorance of the history of the Indian people and the genius of the Indian mind. The late Mr. Chisolm Ansty, a man of immence erudition, once pointed out at a meeting of the East India Association in London, that "we are

apt to forget in this country when we talk of preparing people in the East by education, and all that sort of thing, for Municipal Government and Parliamentary Government, that the East is the parent of Municipalities. Local self Government in the widest acceptation of the term, is as old as the East itself. No matter what may be the religion of the people who inhabit what we call the East, there is not a portion of the country from west to east, from north to south, which is not swarming with municipalities, and not only so, but like to our municipalities of old, they are all bound together as in a species of net work so that you have ready made to your hand the framework of a great system of representation." Sir H. Maine has shown that the Teutonic Mark was hardly so well organized or so essentially representative as an Indian village community, until the precise technical Roman form was engrafted upon it. (*Cheers.*)

But leaving village communities alone, what do we find at the present day over the whole country but all sorts and conditions of people, from the highest to the lowest, meeting together and transacting the business of their numberless castes, in assemblies which, in their constitution and their mode of working, are the exact prototypes of the Saxon Witans, from which the English Parliamentary institutions have sprung. It is true that circumstances never allowed the representative genius of the people to develop forms and organizations for higher political functions. But it is no less true, that the seed and the soil are there, waiting only for the skilful hand, and the watchful mind, which we of the Congress firmly believe we have secured in the presence of Englishmen in this country. The disdainful attitude of Lord Salisbury as to our aptitude for representative institutions need, however, bring no despair to our minds. His late Chief, Lord Beaconsfield, once said of him on a memorable occasion that he was a man who never measured his phrases or his sweeping assertions. On the contrary, I draw an augury of good hope from his pronouncement and that made by his son Lord Hugh Cecil that "the Indian was not only a good Government, but it was probably the best conceivable Government that the population could possibly live under." On the eve of the passing of the great English Reform Bill, the Duke of Wellington, then the Tory Prime Minister, proclaimed in the same House of Lords that the existing constitution of the House of Commons was perfect, and that the wit of man could not *a priori* have devised anything so perfect. The declaration was received by the Liberals as a sure portent of victory; and the Reform Bill was passed within little more than a year after. I trust that the Salisbury pronouncement may prove prophetic in the same way. (*Cheers.*)

It is needless to discuss Lord Cross's perfunctory measure any further; even with the amendment which Lord Northbrook succeeded in getting accepted, it left the House of Lords in the same lifeless condition in which it entered. As soon as it reached the House of Commons, Mr. Bradlaugh fastened on it at once. It was true that he had got there his own bill, but Mr. Bradlaugh is a master of parliamentary tactics inferior, if to any, only to Mr. Gladstone. He at once perceived that the supreme struggle was to be no more between one scheme and

another, between territorial electorates or Local Boards, but that every nerve would have to be strained and every resource husbanded, to obtain in the first place recognition of the elective principle. That secured, everything else would follow in its own good time. With a masterly comprehension of the situation, he placed before the House amendments to the Bill, directed to substitute the process of election for that of nomination. The Bill and the amendments have however all gone the way of the majority, and the session closed without the opportunity of discussing them. Profiting, however, by the lessons in which the experience of the last twelve months was prolific, both without and within the walls of Parliament, Mr. Bradlaugh has hit upon the notable expedient of ploughing with Lord Cross's heifer. He has already introduced a new Bill, based on the same lines as Lord Cross's Bill, but vivifying it by the affirmation of the principle for which we are fighting. That Bill will be laid before you for your consideration. It will be for you to deal with it in your wisdom. However you may decide, of one thing I am certain, that you will maintain the character for moderation, sagacity, and practical good sense which you have so arduously acquired by your self-sacrificing and noble labours during the five years of the existence of the Congress. It is not for me to anticipate your verdict. But I am sure you will allow me, out of my anxious solicitude for the triumph of the cause we have also earnestly at heart, to state the reasons which to my mind make so imperatively for the acceptance of the new draft, in which I cannot but recognize the statesmanlike craft and thorough knowledge of the shifting phases of English politics which Mr. Bradlaugh so eminently possesses, and which, as we all earnestly pray, promises to place him at no distant date in the front ranks of politicians in office, as he already is in the front ranks of those not in office. The old draft, admirably devised in some respects,—with many virtues, and a few faults,—has not proved congenial to the English political mind, averse to new departures, and looking askance at theoretical airs of perfection. The new Bill has, on the other hand, all the elements of success in its favour. Its most striking merit is that it gathers round it the cautious, the carefully weighed, and responsible opinions of some of the best Viceroys we have ever had. Lord Northbrook has pronounced in favour of a properly safe-guarded application of some mode of election. The righteous sympathies of the Marquis of Ripon are as warmly with us as ever, and his great authority weighs on the same side. Still more valuable, as coming from a viceroy who left only the other day, is the measured and calculated approval which Lord Dufferin has recorded in a despatch, in referring to which I hope I am not making myself liable to the terrors of the Official Secret's Act. In mentioning Lord Dufferin, I will frankly say that we have not sufficiently recognised the great debt of gratitude which we owe to him in this respect, partly, I believe, through ignorance, and partly through misappreciation of the course he adopted, to neutralize opposition against the measures he recommended. An unrivalled diplomatist, his wary statesmanship was apt to assume the hues of the craft of which he is so accomplished a master. He sought an occasion when

he could launch his proposals without provoking disagreement, endeavouring rather to conciliate it. The epoch-making St. Andrew's Dinner of 1888 offered him the needful opportunity. He knew Scotchmen, and their matter-of-fact character, so inimitably delineated by Charles Lamb. He knew, as that charming essayist tells us, that "surmises, guesses, misgivings, half intuitions, partial illuminations, dim instincts, embryo conceptions had no place in their brain or vocabulary." He drew before his hosts a vivid and alarming picture of imaginary Congress proposals—of "an ideal authoritatively suggested of the creation of a representative body or bodies, in which the official element shall be in a minority, who shall have what is called the power of the purse, and who, through this instrumentality, shall be able to bring the British executive into subjection to their will." But while his excited and valiant hosts rushed off, crying Scotchmen to the rescue, to tilt at windmills, he quietly threw in a sympathetic recognition of our just and legitimate aspirations, and proceeded to record a minute in which he substantially packed up the veritable Congress proposals. In this Despatch Lord Dufferin has briefly described his scheme as a plan for the enlargement of the Provincial Councils, for the enhancement of their status, the multiplication of their functions, the partial introduction into them of the elective principle, and the liberalization of their general character as political institutions. At this year's St. Andrew's dinner, Sir Charles Elliott eulogized Lord Dufferin's speech as epoch-making and fixing the bounds and limits of our demands—'so far and no further.' We are quite content to go as far; we have never asked to go very much further. We may therefore fairly infer from Sir Charles Elliott's speech that he is in accord and sympathy with the main underlying principles of Lord Dufferin's scheme, and we can therefore congratulate the people of Bengal on their good fortune in possessing a ruler whom we can justly claim to be a true Congresswalla at heart. (*Laughter and cries of Oh! Oh!*)

I will not speculate without official sanction on the views of the present Viceroy. But I may permit myself to remind you that it was to Henry Marquis of Lansdowne that Macaulay dedicated those speeches, in one of which, dipping far into the future, he spoke about the future Government of India in that noble passage with which we are all familiar: "The destinies of our Indian Empire are covered with thick darkness. It is difficult to form any conjecture as to the fate reserved for a state which resembles no other in history, and which forms by itself a separate class of political phenomena. The laws which regulate its growth and decay are still unknown to us. It may be that the public mind of India may expand under our system till it has outgrown that system; that by good Government we may educate our subjects into a capacity for better government; that having become instructed in European knowledge they may in some future age demand European institutions. Whether such a day will ever come I know not. But never will I attempt to avert or retard it. Whenever it comes, it will be the proudest day in English history. To have found a great people sunk in the lowest depths of slavery and superstition, to have so ruled them as to have made them

desirous and capable of all the privileges of citizens, would indeed be a title to glory all our own." The dawn of that day which Macaulay foresaw, in dim, but prophetic, vision, is now breaking on the horizon ; the curtain is rising on the drama which unfolds the vista to that title to glory. Let us earnestly hope that the present illustrious bearer of the great historic name of Lansdowne, who, by a wonderful ordering of events, has now come to rule over us, may watch the glowing streaks of light with generous sympathy, and may preside over the march of events with timely and provident statesmanship. *(Loud cheers).*

This weighty concensus of the best viceregal opinion which I have placed before you, in favour of the principle of the new draft, we may expect to be backed up by the potent voice of that Grand Old Man, whom we reverence, not only as the greatest parliamentary leader of modern times, but as the individual embodiment of the highest conception of moral and political duty which English statesmanship has reached in the 19th century. You are aware that Mr. Bradlaugh has recently declared that he was authorized to say that the course pursued by him in reference to the Government Bill, in endeavouring to obtain a recognition of the elective principle, was approved by Mr. Gladstone, who intended to have supported him by speech. It would require considerations of overpowering force, indeed, to persuade us to any course by which we might run the risk of losing such an almost certain pledge of ultimate victory. *(Cheers).*

Another potent factor has come into existence within this year, which is calculated to help us materially—if we confine our efforts to the simple issue of election *versus* nomination—in the force of English public opinion which, without undertaking to pronounce on questions of detail, has now declared itself to a very considerable extent emphatically in favour of the vital principle of election. The credit of informing the English mind and stirring the English conscience on this momentous question belongs to that small band of noble workers who were appointed at the last Congress to plead the cause of India before the great English people in their own country, and who cheerfully crossed the seas in obedience to such a call of duty, without counting the inevitable cost and sacrifice. The task which they undertook was a formidable one ; they have discharged it in a manner of which it is difficult to speak too highly. Of the leader of that band I cannot trust myself to speak with sober moderation, when I remember that it is to his genius we owe that flash of light which pointed out the creation of a body like the Congress, as fraught with the promotion of the best interests of English rule in India. I know there are numerous claimants for the credit of the idea, but if I may be pardoned for employing the rudely forcible language of Carlyle, "the firepan, the kindling, the bitumen were his own ; but the lumber of rags, old wood, and nameless combustible rubbish (for all is fuel to him) was gathered from hucksters and of every description under Heaven. Whereby indeed hucksters enough have been heard to exclaim : Out upon it, the fire is *mine.*" He brought to bear upon his new enterprise the same zeal and fervour combined with thoughtful judgment, that he has unsparingly bestowed for so many years upon the cause to which he has devoted his life.

His presence on the Congress Deputation entailed a further sacrifice and affliction, for which we can offer no consolation or reparation except our deepest and most respectful sympathy. In his great and noble mission, Mr. Hume (*Loud cheers*) had the entire co-operation of a man of no ordinary powers and capacity. The rare and unrivalled powers of oratory which we have learned to admire in Mr. Surendranath Bannerji (*cheers*)—for it is of him I speak—never shone with more brilliant effect than when he was pleading the cause of his countrymen at the bar of the English people, with a fire and energy that extorted universal respect and admiration. They had a powerful coadjutor in my friend Mr. Eardley Norton, who has known so well how to make *splendid* use of the heritage of great thoughts and noble deeds which he received from his distinguished father. Mr. Mudholkar from the Central Provinces did yeoman service in the same cause, and his sober and thoughtful eloquence did not carry less weight than that of his brilliant colleagues. There is no need for me to say anything of the services of Sir William Wedderburn, Mr. Dadabhai Naoroji, and our other friends in England. But I cannot allow this opportunity to pass without grateful acknowledgment of the unceasing toil, the prodigious energy, and the organizing capacity contributed by Mr. William Digby. The delegates assembled here might render no inconsiderable service to our cause if they exerted themselves to stimulate by thousands and tens of thousands the circulation of the Congress paper entitled 'India,' started under the auspices of our British Committee and conducted with such marked ability by him, and which has done, and promises to do, more and more, such incalculable benefit to the object we have at heart. The result of the English campaign clearly shows the wisdom of the new plan of operations suggested by Mr. Bradlaugh. It seems to me that success is well within our reach, if we resolutely apply ourselves to obtain, in the first instance at least, the recognition and application of the principle of election in the organization of our Legislative Councils. Let us then strive for it with the sagacity of practical men, who have not learnt in vain the lessons taught by English political history, and who know the value of moderate, gradual, and substantial gain.

To the many reasons which have been set forth in Congress after Congress, proving the imperative need of reformed Councils, another has been now added. The discussion of the Indian Budget in the House of Commons was always more or less of a sham; but it was a sham for which the officials of the India Office thought it at least a matter of decency to shed a tear of remorse. But now Sir John Gorst has boldly and candidly declared in his place in the House that there need be no sham regret at all; that if anything, it was rather to be hoped and wished for, that the House of Commons should not waste its time over the weary farce. (*Shame, Shame.*) It is now officially declared that it is right and proper that Parliament should,—to use Mr. Yule's happy way of putting it,—throw "the great and solemn trust of an inscrutable Providence" back into the hands of Providence to be looked after as Providence itself thinks best with such grace as Providence may choose to pour on the heads of Sir John Gorst, his heirs, successors and assigns. I

think you will agree with me that when the responsible advisers of the Crown on Indian matters propound doctrines of such a character, it is high time that we should raise our united voice to demand Local Councils possessing some guarantees for energy and efficiency. (*Cheers.*)

It has been said that our united voice is the voice only of a certain portion of the people and not of the masses; and that it is even then the voice of indifference, and not of urgency and excitement. These remarks are intended to be cast as matters of reproach against the Congress ; properly understood they constitute its chief glory. If the masses were capable of giving articulate expression to definite political demands, then the time would have arrived, not for consultative Councils but for representative institutions. It is because they are still unable to do so that the function and the duty devolve upon their educated and enlightened compatriots to feel, to understand and to interpret their grievances and requirements, and to suggest and indicate how these can best be redressed and met. History teaches us that such has been the Law of widening progress in all ages and all countries, notably in England itself. That function and that duty, which thus devolve upon us, is best discharged, not in times of alarm and uneasiness, of anger and excitement, but when the heart is loyal and clear and reason unclouded. It is, I repeat, the glory of the Congress that the educated and enlightened people of the country seek to repay the debt of gratitude, which they owe for the priceless boon of education, by pleading, and pleading temperately, for timely and provident statesmanship. (*Cheers.*)

I have no fears but that English statesmanship will ultimately respond to the call. I have unbounded faith in the living and fertilizing principles of English culture and English civilization. It may be that, at times, the prospect may look dark and gloomy. Anglo-Indian opposition may look fierce and uncompromising. But my faith is large, even in Anglo-Indians. As in the whole universe, so in individuals, in communities, there is a perpetual conflict going on between the higher and lower passions and impulses of our nature. Perhaps some of you have read a little novel, called Dr. Jekyll and Mr. Hyde, the plot of which hinges on the conflict between the two sides of a man's nature, the higher and the lower, embodied each, for the time being, in a separate and distinct individuality. If the lower tendencies are sometimes paramount in the Hydes of Anglo-Indian society, if as our last President, Sir W. Wedderburn said, the interests of the services are antagonistic to and prevail over the interests of the Indian people, it is still the oscillation of the struggle ; it is still only one side of the shield. They cannot permanently divest themselves of the higher and nobler nature, which, in the end, must prevail, and which has prevailed in so many honorable, distinguished and illustrious instances. They are after all a part and parcel of the great English nation, bone of their bone, and flesh of their flesh, and they must even work along the main lines of that noble policy which Great Britain has deliberately adopted for the government of this country. When, in the inscrutable dispensation of Providence, India was assigned to the care of England, one

can almost imagine that the choice was offered to her as to Isreal of old: "Behold I have placed before you a blessing and a curse; a blessing, if ye will obey the commandments of the Lord your God: a curse, if ye will not obey the commandments of the Lord your God, but go after other gods whom ye have not known." All the great forces of English life and society, moral, social, intellectual, political, are, if slowly, yet steadily and irresistibly, declaring themselves for the choice which will make the connection of England and India a blessing to themselves, and to the whole world, for countless generations. Our Congress asks but to serve as a modest handmaid to that movement, asks but to be allowed to show the pits and the falls, asks but to be allowed to join in the blessing which England will as surely earn as there is an "Eternal that maketh for righteousness." (*Cheers.*)

I appeal to all true Englishmen—to candid friends as to generous foes—not to let this prayer go in vain. It may be that we sometimes speak in uncouth and outlandish ways, it may be that we sometimes stray in some confusion of thought and language; still it is the prayer of a rising, growing and hopeful nation. I will appeal to them to listen to the sage counsels of one of the most careful and observant of their modern politicians, who, like the prophet Balaam, called, I will not say, exactly to curse us, has however blessed us utterly. In his "Problems of Greater Britain," Sir Charles Dilke thus sums up his views on the Congress: "Argument upon the matter is to be desired, but not invective, and there is so much reason to think that the Congress movement really represents the cultivated intelligence of the country, that those who ridicule it do harm to the imperial interest of Great Britain, bitterly wounding and alienating men who are justified in what they do, who do it in reasonable and cautious form, and who ought to be conciliated by being met half-way. (*Cheers.*) The official class themselves admit that many of the natives who attack the Congress do so to ingratiate themselves with their British rulers and to push their claims for decorations. (*Hear, hear.*) Our first duty in India is that of defending the country against anarchy and invasion, but our other greatest duty is to learn how to live with what is commonly called the Congress movement, namely, with the development of that new India which we have ourselves created. Our past work in India has been a splendid task, splendidly performed, but there is a still nobler one before us, and one larger even than that labour on the Irish problem to which our public men on both sides seem too much inclined to give their whole attention." So careful an estimate of the work and spirit of the Congress movement cannot but commend itself to all thoughtful minds.

However that may be, our duty lies clear before us to go on with our work firmly and fearlessly, but with moderation, and above all with humility. If we might be permitted to adopt those noble words of Cardinal Newman, we may say—

Lead kindly light amid the encircling gloom,
  Lead thou me on!
The night is dark and I am far from home,
  Lead thou me on!
Keep thou my feet, I do not ask to see,
  The distant path, one step's enough for me. (*cheers.*)

Seventh Congress—Nagpore—1891.

Mr. P. Ananda Charlu.

Friends and Fellow Citizens,—I thank you most warmly for making me take the Presidential Chair on this occasion. That chair has narrowly missed a far higher honor than I can do to it, owing to two unforeseen occurrences. One of these occurrences is that the Hon'ble Pundit Ajoodhia Nath is unfortunately, for both you and me, not a Madrasee. Were it not that he generously abdicated the dignity in favour of Madras, I should gladly have avoided the danger of accepting a situation that would draw me into comparison with that unselfish, whole-hearted, intrepid, and outspoken apostle of this great national movement. (*Cheers.*) But in this world of imperfections and of complex considerations, duty does not always fall on the fittest shoulders, and there is the additional reason that the unanimous mandate of the country compels my obedience.

The second occurrence I allude to, as the cause of my standing here to-day, is that my friend Dewan Bahadur Subramaniya Iyer has been raised to a seat on the High Court Bench of Madras. At the first blush, this may seem a matter for regret; but, from the point of view from which I regard it, it affords reason for congratulation, rather than for regret, and that, even *so far as the Congress is concerned*; or does it not give us another and eloquent proof that, where other merits exist, active service in the cause of the public does, by no means, clash with the equally honourable ambition of obtaining high office as a public servant. Mr. Subramaniya Iyer's is the rare case of one who had not deliberately stood aloof from all public movements, with the possible prospect of entering Government service, and who, not lured away from the call of public duty by the first instalment of Government patronage, returned to that duty, as cheerfully and as actively as before, and who has been nevertheless again selected, to fill a high place in the official hierarchy of this country. With a scrupulous regard for the demands of the both vocations, he took particular care that neither suffered by reason of the other, or on account of the other. Therefore, I assure you that, without meaning that I hope adequately to fill his place as the President of this great National Assembly, it should be a matter of rejoicing to the Congress that another of its prominent workers should have been elevated to the most dignified office, as yet open to indigenous talent, under the British administration of this country.

These personal considerations remind me of the loss—the irreparable loss—which the Congress has sustained, since its last sitting, by the lamented death of

Mr. Charles Bradlaugh. *He* was the redoubtable champion who brought, within the domain of practical politics, one of the foremost subjects in the Congress programme. Till Mr. Bradlaugh, who may, without exaggeration, be described as an embodiment of universal benevolence, befriended our cause with his characteristic unselfishness, all our pathetic appeals for a forward step, in the direction of reforming our Legislative Councils, remained a veritable cry in the wilderness ; and the fact that, upon his death, even Lord Cross's halting measure was dropped, puts this beyond all doubt.

It is a matter for deep sorrow that Mr. Charles Bradlaugh's useful career was cut short before he could redeem even his guarded promise to us, that he hoped to carve and shape a step or two in the up-hill work that lay in front of us—a work of such magnitude and importance as to make him weigh most scrupulously the words he used. There is little prospect of any *one* man proving to us the tower of strength that he unquestionably was, during the short time that we had the benefit of his lively sympathy and unremitting effort. We have indeed been slow to erect a memorial suited to his great merits and his unpurchased services in our cause ; and our unfriendly critics have *not* been slow to make capital out of this seeming apathy. In the Presidency from which I come, famine and its attendant evils are, within my personal knowledge, chiefly answerable for this seeming remissness in the fulfilment of our duty—a duty which, as we view it, consists in a recognition of the work of that unflinching advocate of the people's rights, not merely by the monied few, but also by that far larger class to which he belonged, and of which he was proud to declare that he reckoned himself as one. Our monsoons, gentlemen, have begun to give signs of improvement, though after a very long delay. May this improved state of things bring in thousands of small contributions which, tiny like the rain drops individually, may in the aggregate fill to overflowing the coffers of the many Bradlaugh Committees in the land. I have little doubt that this earnest appeal will meet with a ready, wide and adequate response before many months are over.

I shall next invite you, brethren, to join me in paying a similar loving, though mournful, tribute to the memories of two distinguished men who had figured as the Chairmen of Congress Reception Committees, and of whom death has robbed us since our last session—Raja Sir T. Madhava Rao, K.C.S.I., and Dr. Rejendra Lala Mitra, the latter of whom is, I think, better described and wider known under that title, which is a tribute to his profound scholarship and varied learning, than by the distinctions of Rai Bahadur and of Rajah--distinctions which came to him too late to add any lustre to his already brilliant fame. Our sincere gratitude is due to them for the eloquent exposition of the views of the Congress Party which their speeches as Chairmen embodied, and for the prominent part they took in the sittings of the Congress which they so heartily ushered in.

One more sincere friend of India, happily living and breathing in our midst and meriting our warmest acknowledgment, remains yet to be named—our General Secretary, Mr. A. O. Hume. (*Cheers.*) Through good report and through evil

report, and at the sacrifice of health, money, well-earned ease, and peace of mind, he has steadily and earnestly adhered to his labour of love in the progressive interests of the people of this country, and he has thus earned, not only *our* love and gratitude, but I hope also the love and gratitude of our children and children's children. (*Loud Cheers.*)

He has recently given us warning that he contemplates an early retirement from his Indian field of labour—a retirement which involves the resignation of his office as the General Secretary of the Indian National Congress. This, we must confess, has come upon us as a surprise, though we had no business to be unprepared for it. This unpreparedness is, in the main, traceable to the habits generated in us by the monopolising character of British Indian rule which, taking upon itself all the solicitudes and almost all the responsibilities of the administration of the country, has given but little occasion for the development in us of the capacities and aptitude necessary for facing with confidence a sudden emergency. If this were the second or third Session of the Congress, I should despond and shudder at the inevitable consequences. But thanks to his indefatigable exertions and his prophetic sagacity, he has coupled his warning with the inspiriting assurance that one great work of the Congress has been accomplished; that its programme has been built up and promulgated; that the present seventh session is needed, not so much to discuss new subjects, as to put the seal on all that its predecessors has done; and that it completes one distinct stage of our progress.

These are, without doubt, noble and encouraging words, and every syllable of them deserves our earnest attention. Let us look back on our career. What was our task at starting? In the words of our General Secretary, "a great work had to be done—we had to clear our own ideas and then make them clear to our opponents;—to thresh out by persistent discussion the wheat of our aspirations from the great body of chaff that must, in the very nature of things, have accompanied it. We had to find out exactly what those reforms were, which the country, as a whole, most desired; we had to evolve and formulate a clear and succinct programme—to erect a standard around which, now and for all time, until that programme is realized, all reformers and well-wishers of India could gather; and we had to place that programme on record in such a form that neither foreign autocrats nor domestic traitors could efface its pregnant lines," or read into those lines a meaning that they were not intended to convey.

Now, let us note how we were a mere handful, numbering less than four score when we started on our national mission; how at that moment it was little more than an untried, though cherished, idea that we should strive to mitigate, if not to eradicate, race prejudices, to disarm creed-antipathies, and to remove provincial jealousies; and how, by that achievement as a means towards an end, we wished to develop and consolidate sentiments of national unity. Let us next note that, when under the impulse then given to our renovated national instincts, we met next year in Calcutta, that ripe scholar and sober antiquarian Dr. Rajendra Lala Mitra declared that he saw in the assembly before him the commencement of the realization

of the dream of his life, *viz*, to witness the scattered units of his race come together, coalesce, and stand welded into one nation. Then came our session in Madras, and there we succeeded in blotting out the stigma that one part of our country was "benighted," and we exhibited the spectacle of a gathering, more considerable in numbers, more representative in composition, more adequate in the proportion of the Muhammadan contingent, more cordial in feeling, more in unison with the name of *this* institution, wider in basis and altogether a nearer approximation than had till then been attained to the conception of a nationality in that sense in which alone that word has a meaning in political parlance. On the impregnable basis which that gathering illustrated, the subsequent sessions of the Congress were constituted, and our success has been great and signal.

To detract from the worth and significance of the well-knit, ever-expanding phalanx known as the Indian National Congress, a desultory controversy was raised round the word *nationality*,—a controversy at once learned and unlearned, ingenious and stupid, etymological and ethnological. Now a common religion was put forward as the *differentia*; now a common language; now a proved or provable common extraction; and now the presence of the privileges of commensality and inter-conjugal kinship. These ill-considered and ill-intentioned hypotheses have, one and all, fallen to the ground, and no wonder: for the evident circumstance was lost sight of, that words might have divers acceptations—each most appropriate for one purpose, and, in a like degree, inappropriate for other purposes. In my view the word "nationality" should be taken to have the same meaning as the Sanskrit *Prajah*, which is the correlative of the term Rajah—the ruling power. Though, like the term *Prajah*, it may have various significations, it has but one obvious, unmistakable meaning in political language *viz.*, the aggregate of those that are (to adapt and adopt the words of a writer in the *National Review*)—"citizens of one country, subordinate to one power, subject to one supreme Legislature, taxed by one authority, influenced, for weal or woe, by one system of administration, urged by like impulses to secure like rights and to be relieved of like burdens." It is in reality a potential class. In the first place it has for its central stock—like the trunk of a tree—the people who have for ages and generations settled and domiciled in a country, with more or less ethnic identity at bottom and more or less unified by being continually subjected to identical environments and to the inevitable process of assimilation. In the next place it gets added to, from time to time, by the accession of other peoples—like scions engrafted on the central stem, or like creepers attaching thereto—who settle in the country in a like manner, and come under the many unifying influences already referred to, though *still* exhibiting marks of separateness and distinctness. Affirm this standard, and you have an Indian nation. Deny it, and you have a nation *nowhere* on the face of the earth. (*Cheers.*)

A common language, a common religion, inter-dining, and inter-marriage are, without doubt, potent auxiliaries. These help, no doubt, by affording facilities for co-operation and by rendering easy the attainment of common objects. But, for all

that, they are (at best) inseparable accidents, and it betrays a grievous obliquity of judgment to esteem them as constituting the very essence of what is understood by the term *nation*. We began, proceeded, and have persevered up to this day on the tacit assumption that such is the correct doctrine, and let us continue to exert ourselves on that principle at least as a working definition; because, by pursuing such a course, and within the short period of seven years, we have accomplished *the great and palpable fact* that the Hindu and Mahomedan populations of this country—long separated from one another—long divided by parochial differences—long kept apart and estranged from one another by sectional and sectarian jealousies—have at last recognised one another as members of a single brotherhood, despite the many differences that still linger. This a magnificent product of the Congress *as a mighty nationaliser*. The part it has already played in this direction is, indeed, glorious, and I am sure you will not charge me with holding Utopian views if, on the basis of what has been achieved and in view to the vital interests involved, I venture to predict that, through the Agency of the Congress, far more intimate relations and far closer forms of kinship are in store for us in the not-remote future.

If this, brethern, is the subjective benefit, we, as the members of the Congress have secured, what have we to show as its objective results? I need not accumulate facts to make this clear. Let us first recall to our minds that, when we met at Bombay in the first year of our existence, we were referred to by the then head of the Indian Government only as an influential and intelligent body. Let us next remember that, when last year we assembled in the capital of this Empire, the present head of the Indian Government stamped and labelled us as an *established constitutional party*, carrying on a *legilimate* work with *legitimate* instruments and according to *acknowledged* methods. This is much for an Indian Viceroy to accept, though it is open to doubt whether we have received *all* our due, and whether we do not, correctly speaking, correspond to a more numerous, more influential, and more favoured party in England. Not only was there this change of opinion about ourselves, but there has been a distinct step taken by the authorities on the lines we had chalked out for reform. What was Lord Cross's India Bill but a confirmation of our views and a response—though a faltering response—to our chorus voice. May we not also justly take credit for the labors (such as they were) of the Public Service Commission and the consequent raising of age for candidates to the Indian Covenanted Service, the inauguration of the policy of a larger recruitment of the Uncovenanted Service from the natives of this country, the creation of a Legislative Council for the N. W. Provinces, and a *marked improvement* in the class or quality of members selected for all the Legislative Councils in the country ever since. These are unmistakable evidences of our objective achievements, and I think, gentlemen, they are such as we may well be proud of.

But, notwithstanding all these grounds for congratulating ourselves, the lamentable fact remains that, *in regard to our higher claims*, little beyond lip-concession

in this country and a half-hearted and halting measure (now shelved) in the imperial metropolis, has as yet fallen to our lot. We may work ever so long in this country, the prospect does not seem to brighten; and the real cause may chiefly be that "the Government in India has no power; the Council in London has no power; the House of Commons *has* the power, but it refuses or neglects to exercise it," as Mr. Yule asserted from his place as the President of our session at Allahabad.

There is no doubt that Mr. Yule's last disjunctive sentence means more than he wished to convey. Nor did he intend all that is signified by his statement that six hundred and fifty odd members, who are bound to be the guardians and protectors of India's rights and liberties, " have thrown the great and solemn trust of an inscrutable Providence back upon the hands of Providence to be looked after as Providence itself thought best." Mr. Yule himself made this clear when he virtually told us, almost immediately after, that the members of the House of Commons had not time enough and information enough on the questions that came up before them, to be able to judge rightly.

What then is the remedy? On whom is it incumbent to seek and secure the remedy? The answer has been given, that the remedy lies in instructing the British public, and in raising their level of information regarding Indian affairs to the standard of usefulness. The further answer has been given, that the duty of seeking and securing that remedy lies primarily on ourselves, secondarily on the British voting and thought-leading public, and finally on their accredited representatives who constitute the House of Commons. In partial discharge of these duties, we have maintained the British Congress Committee, composed of earnest and generous souls, working gratuitously for us, with a talented Secretary in Mr. Digby, whose well-informed, timely and earnest efforts in our behalf are the admiration of our friends and a thorn in the ribs of those of our foes, who endeavour to gain a point by deluding an uninstructed public with false and ill-founded representations. No words of mine are necessary to bring home to you the fact that a more capable, self-denying, and benevolent body of men never put their shoulders to a philanthrophic work in our interests, and that a larger measure of success was never achieved than was accomplished by them, with their circumscribed opportunities and with many other demands on their time and attention. There are abundant signs that their numbers will increase, and that the sphere of their influence and usefulness will widen, provided we do, as I shall presently show, what is expected of us. A second agency which has come into being, and which is entirely due to British generosity, is the Indian party formed in the House of Commons itself. Mr. Charles Bradlaugh was its brilliant centre-piece and since death filched that priceless jewel from us, the setting has remained with the socket still to be filled in. Here, again, it depends on ourselves whether *that* gap is to be adequately filled, and that body is to receive, in the requisite measure, accession of strength in numbers and influence; or whether we are to be thrown back a quarter of a century, and find, ourselves in the pre-Bradlaugh, pre-Congress, and pre-Ripon days of apathy, obscurity and inert resignation (*No, no*).

The anxious and well-considered advice of the British Congress Committee, and the mature opinion of the members of the Parliamentary Indian party, concur in urging us to change the *venue*—to transfer our operations to London itself. Members of our body, who have already rendered yeoman service in England as our delegates before the British public, are of the same mind. Any doubt that may still linger must be dispelled by the fact that, although Lord Dufferin, as the head of the Indian Government, urged the wisdom and desirability of adopting some form of the elective principle in the constitution of our Legislative Councils, his recommendation, based—be it noted—on his personal grasp of local conditions, has been burked; and that even the makeshift of a limping substitute for it, in the shape of Lord Cross's India Bill, has been shelved and pigeon-holed no one knows for how long, no one can tell with what motives. In the face of such a fate having overtaken the suggestions of the most cautious, diplomatic and wary Viceroy we have had, can we expect that either the present Viceroy, albeit he has put his seal of approval on us as a constitutional party, or any of his successors, will so far *discount their self-respect* as to court a similar summary and unceremonious treatment of their proposals ! It seems to me that the cumulative force of all these considerations points unmistakably to the absolute necessity of translating ourselves to London with the Congress banner over our heads, emblazoned with the figure of the Union Jack, as much for indicating our aims and objects as for fanning away from the delegates, assembled under its shade, all the noxious exhalations from those foul mouths which impute to us seditious intentions and anti-English proclivities,—as if, forsooth, the leaders of the Congress, who are the outcome of the British rule, and whose very existence depends on the maintenance of the British power in India, could be so irrational as to adopt the suicidal policy of lopping off the very branch on which they stand.

This momentous step of holding a meeting in London we can neither avoid nor postpone ; and I entreat you to revolve it earnestly in your minds, and to resolve right manfully to do what you finally find to be your plain duty. In regard to this step, I do not say that there are not serious difficulties to overcome. One great barrier—the dread of social ostracism—is not to be got rid of by mere rhetorical outbursts. The question deserves our most serious consideration.

It has to be soberly and dispassionately noted whether the restrictions as to the countries we could visit were not more stringent by far in the earliest times than ever after ; whether many regions, originally tabooed in express terms in the Smrithis, were not in later days tacitly taken out of the category of forbidden land for an Aryan to enter ; whether, in so far as a sea voyage is concerned, a distinction has not been drawn between the north and the south of India on the ground of custom ; and whether, where the custom had existed, it was not allowed to be unobjectionable and perfectly compatible with being within the pale of Hinduism ; and whether, lastly, and above all, there is not ground for the conclusion that the stringency of the rules in the Smrithis has been authoritatively declared to admit of relaxation in so far as the Grihasta is concerned, though not

in the case of those who, vowing to consecrate themselves to a life of piety, practically release themselves from social and political duties and obligations, and are *therefore* denied the immunities held out to those who labour *for* and *in* such society.

If we decide in the affirmative, infinite will be our credit. If in so deciding it, we are forsaken by our kith and kin, it will still be considerably to our credit that we have made a heroic sacrifice for the sake of our country and in the interests of those very kith and kin who may be so cruel as to cast us off. But such social persecution and banishment cannot continue for ever. Our cause is so just and righteous, our principles and methods of action so loyal and upright, our opportunities of doing good so many and varied, that in the long run even our worst enemies will learn to find in us their best friends, and such of our kinsmen as estrange themselves from us will, I believe, gladly associate with us again and restore to us the social privileges that they temporarily withhold from us. Such is my belief, judging from precedents, in other, yet analogous, departures. But if the worst should happen, there is already the beginning of a Congress-caste fundamentally based on Hinduism and substantially in accord with its dictates, and such a visitation as a determined social banishment lasting for any length of time would only tend to cement that caste more closely together and to greater purpose. Thus would it be possible to form the nucleus of a daily multiplying and expansive fraternity, and it would soon be seen at large that by social union with it there is much to gain in matters mundane and little to lose in interests truly spiritual.

Should we succeed in holding a Session in London, and thereby secure seats for *elected* members in our Legislative Councils, that in itself would give us much indirect help in pushing on internal reform. A decent interment of rather moribund laws, virtually dead but lingering only to thwart, and the introduction of fresh laws to give an impulse to the betterment of our social condition, are now hopeless impossibilities. The Government fight shy of them, and nominated members, who take their clue from that Government, are equally timorous. If, however, this quiescence is departed from in any instance under the existing system, the Government and the members that lend themselves to the departure at once fall victims to caluminous abuse and unpopularity; for it is quite possible for a minority to raise a powerful cry and give it the character of a popular outburst of indignation. As matters stand, no means exist for gauging the popular feeling for or against the measure. Newspapers have too often given an uncertain sound, and commissions to take evidence cannot sit long enough and examine a large enough number of witnesses to be sure that a correct conclusion has been reached. If, as we propose, elected members should have seats among our legislators, the problem would be fairly solved. Men seeking election, would find it necessary to present themselves with such proposals as, in their view might be acceptable to the popular mind, and the fact of their being elected or rejected would, in many cases, afford conclusive proof whether the legislation proposed was well-timed or not, in

harmony with popular feeling or at variance with it. Should any dispute arise as to whether a legislative measure proposed is popular or otherwise, the member in charge of it, and members in favour of it, might resign their seats and seek re-election on that very measure, while the Government, not identifying itself with the measure, would, without incurring any odium, be able to allow useful legislation to go on or to be tried, respecting matters which its solicitude, not to be misunderstood and not to incur unpopularity, might make it avoid.

Whatever may be our decision as to the duty of sending a gallant contingent to London to make up the Session of the Congress there, it is undoubtedly imperative on us to penetrate to the masses here more than hitherto, and deeply imbue them with the spirit of the Congress which is only another name for national sentiment. (*Cheers.*) The impression is still prevalent that as yet the effect of our efforts in this direction has been only slight, and we have done little more than to scratch the outer skin and to awaken the spasmodic enthusiasm of our unanglicised brethren. Let us approach them, with all the energy and fervour that we have hitherto brought to the Congress platform, but which energy and fervour—so far as the Indian field is concerned—will not, on the present scale, be necessary for that purpose in future, quite apart from the question whether we should close our Congress labours in India for a time.

Whether we resolve to rest on our oars or not, it becomes our bounden duty all the same to go more amid the masses and to saturate their minds with the aspirations of a united nationality. There is another *very solid reason* for such effort. It involves the fulfilment of a trust; for, constituting the upper strata of the Indian society, we have first caught the light of the enlightened West—as mountain tops catch the first glimpses of the rising sun. But, unlike those glimpses, that light will not descend to the lower strata of our society, unless we actively transmit it from a sense of duty and a sense of honor.

Let us impart to our people, as we are in righteousness bound to do, our conviction that they should cease to look upon the British rule as the rule of a foreign people. We should ask them to look upon our British rulers as filling a gap that has existed in our national economy—as taking the place once held by the Kshatria, and as being therefore part and parcel of the traditional administrative mechanism of the land.

Let us not heed the sinister cry that we shall thereby drag the people of this country into discussing politics—into paths they are supposed never before to have trodden. For our part, *we* shall only act up to the undoubted right involved in the fact that we are England's subjects; and, as regards our countrymen at large, they will only be brought back to those privileges, which—unquestioned by authority and with the full knowledge of authority—our ancestors are recorded to have enjoyed in their Samsaths, Sabhas and Ootwaras, in the days treated of ir that grand old epic—the Mahabharata.

Gentlemen, I am deeply thankful to you for the patient and indulgent attention you have accorded to me. Our British rulers have indeed withheld from us

the privilege of demonstrating our love and loyalty towards our Sovereign Lady' the Empress Queen by fighting her battles as volunteers under the British flag; but we have still some consolation left in the fact that "peace hath her victories no less renowned than those of war." The Congress platform is the field on which such bloodless triumphs are to be won, and though as yet we have had but a small measure of success, there is ground for hope in what the poet sings,—

"For freedom's battle once begun,
* * * *
Though baffled oft, is ever won."

We, as the pioneers of the movement, may attain little more than the satisfaction of upholding what is right and protesting against what is wrong; but succeeding generations will reap the fruit of our labours, and will cherish with fond remembrance the names of those who had the courage and the humanity, the singleness of purpose and the self-sacrificing devotion to duty, to work for the benefit of posterity, in spite of calumny and persecution and great personal loss. Men, such as these, may attain no titles of distinction from Government, but they are "nobles by the right of an earlier creation." They may fail to win honour from their contemporaries as the truest apostles, but they are "priests by the imposition of a mightier hand"; and, when their life's work is done, they will have that highest of all earthly rewards,—the sense of having left their country better than they had found it,—the glory of having built up into a united and compact nation the divers races and classes of the Indian population, and the satisfaction of having led a people, sunk in political and social torpor, to think and act for themselves, and strive to work out their own well-being by constitutional and righteous methods. (*Loud and continued cheers*).

Eighth Congress—Allahabad—1892.

Mr. W. C. Bonnerjee.

Brother Delegates, Ladies and Gentlemen,—The position, which, by your unanimous voice, you have called me to fill, is a most distinguished and honourable one. I am proud to fill it, and I trust that, with your help and by your forbearance, I may be able to discharge the duties which will be required of me as the President of the Eighth Indian National Congress adequately and satisfactorily. (*Cheers*). Those duties, as all of you who have attended our Congresses before

know, are heavy and onerous in the extreme, and I appeal to you to deal out to me, in the same spirit in which you dealt out to my predecessors, such help and indulgence as may be needed by me.

You have been reminded that I have the honour to be the person, who inaugurated the Congress movement in Bombay, in the year 1885, as its first President. It is singular coincidence that the Bombay Meeting was held on this very day, the 28th of December. The first cycle of our existence thus commenced on the 28th December, under my humble presidency, and ended with the presidency of my friend Mr. Ananda Charlu, who so kindly proposed my election. The second cycle begins on the same day seven years afterwards, again under my humble presidency. At the first Congress there were only a few of us assembled together, but as I pointed out at the time, there were various causes which prevented a larger muster. Those, however, who assembled there on that occasion, were animated by a sincere desire to make the movement a success and fully determined that it should be so if hard work could effect it. And I appeal to those assembled here to-day to say whether that movement has been a success or not. *(Applause)*. Year after year we have met, each meeting vieing with its predecessor in the number of delegates attending it, the sacrifices which the delegates made to attend it, in the energy, zeal and determination with which the business was passed through, and the moderation which throughout characterised the proceedings before the Congress. There can be no doubt—say what those who do not view our proceedings with friendly eyes, may—that the Congress movement has been a success and a conspicuous success. The persons to whom I have referred have been troubling their brains, from almost the very commencement of the movement, to find out how it is that this movement, which they are pleased to call only a "native" movement, has been such a success. And they have hit upon one of the causes, which they have, iterated and reiterated, in season and out of season, as the cause of the success of the Congress; namely, the influence over us of that great man Allan Octavian Hume. *(Loud and prolonged cheers.)* That Mr. Hume possesses, and has exercised, a vast amount of influence over the Congress movement, and over each single Congress which has met, is a fact. We are not only not ashamed to acknowledge it, but we acknowledge it with gratitude to that gentleman, and we are proud of his connection with the Congress. *(Cheers)*. But the movement is only to some extent, and I may say, only to a limited extent, due to the influence which Mr. Hume has exercised over us. It is not the influence of this man, or of that man, or of any third man that has made the Congress what it is. It is the British Professors who have discoursed eloquently to us on the glorious constitution of their country; it is the British Merchants who have shown to us how well to deal with the commodities of our country; it is the British Engineers who have annihilated distance and enabled us to come together for our deliberation from all parts of the Empire; it is the British Planters who have shown us how best to raise the products of our soil; it is all these, in other words, it is all the influences which emanate from British rule in India that have made the

Congress the success it is. (*Cheers*). The Congress is a mere manifestation of the good work that has been done by all those to whom I have referred (and I ought also to have referred to the British missionaries who have worked amongst us;) and all that we wish by this movement to do is, to ask the British public, both in this country and in Great Britain, that, without any strain on the connection which exists between Great Britain and this country, such measures may be adopted by the ruling authorities that the grievances under which we labour may be removed, and that we may hereafter have the same facilities of national life that exist in Great Britain herself. How long it will take us to reach the latter end no one can tell; but it is our duty to keep the hope of it before us, and keep reminding our British fellow subjects that this hope shall always be with us. (*Cheers*).

Some of our critics have been busy in telling us, thinking they knew our affairs better than we know them ourselves, that we ought not to meddle with political matters, but leaving politics aside devote ourselves to social subjects and so improve the social system of our country. I am one of those who have very little faith in the public discussion of social matters; those are things which, I think, ought to be left to the individuals of a community who belong to the same social organisation, to do what they can for its improvement. We know how excited people become when social subjects are discussed in public. Not long ago we had an instance of this when what was called the Age of Consent Bill was introduced into the Viceregal Legislative Council. I do not propose to say one word as to the merits of the controversy that arose over that measure, but I allude to it to illustrate how apt the public mind is to get agitated over these social matters if they are discussed in a hostile and unfriendly spirit in public. But to show to you that those who organised the Congress movement, had not lost sight of the question of social reform, I may state that when we met in Bombay for the first time, the matter was discussed threadbare, with the help of such distinguished social reformers as Dewan Bahadur Raghunath Rao of Madras, Mr. Madeo Govind Ranade, and Mr. Krishnaji Lakshman Nulkar of Poona, Mr. Norendra Nath Sen, and Mr. Janakinath Ghosal of Calcutta, and others. The whole subject was considered from every point of view, and we at last came to the conclusion with the full consent and concurrence of those distinguished men that it would not do for the Congress to meddle itself, as a Congress, with questions of social reform. At the same time we also came to the conclusion, that those gentlemen who were anxious, in a friendly spirit, to discuss their own social organisations should have an opportunity of doing so in the Congress Hall, after the business of the Congress should be over. The principal reason which actuated us in coming to that conclusion was that at our gatherings there would attend delegates following different religions, living under different social systems, all more or less interwoven with their respective religions, and we felt it would not be possible for them as a body to discuss social matters. How is it possible for a Hindu gentlemen to discuss with a Parsee or a Mahomedan gentleman matters connected with Hindu social questions? How is it possible for a Mahomedan gentleman to discuss with Hindu and Parsee gentleman matters

connected with Mahomedan social questions? and how is it possible for a Parsee gentleman to discuss with Hindu and Mahomedan gentleman matters connected with Parsee social customs? We thought, and I hope you will agree that we were right, that under the circumstances, all we could do was to leave it to the Hindus and the Mahomedans, Parsees, and other delegates to discuss their respective social matters in a friendly spirit amongst themselves, and arrive at what conclusions they pleased, and if possible, to get the minority to submit to the views of the majority. (*Cheers*). I may point out that we do not all understand in the same sense what is meant by social reform. Some of us are anxious that our daughters should have the same education as our sons, that they should go to Universities, that they should adopt learned professions; others, who are more timid, would be content with seeing that their children are not given in marriage when very young, and that child widows should not remain widows all the days of their lives. Others, more timid still, would allow social problems to solve themselves. It is impossible to get any common ground, even as regards the members of the same community, be it Hindu, Mahomedan or Parsee with respect to these matters. Thus it was that social questions were left out of the Congress programme; thus it was that the Congress commenced and has since remained, and will, I sincerely trust, always remain as a purely political organisation, devoting its energies to political matters, and political matters only. I am afraid that those, whether belonging to our own country or to any other country, who find fault with us for not making social subjects a part of our work, cherish a secret with that, we might all be set by the ears, as we were all set by the ears by the Age of Consent Bill, and that thus we might come to an ignominious end. They mean us no good, and when we find critics of that description talking of the Congress as only fit to discuss social problems, I think the wider the berth we give them the better. (*Cheers*).

I, for one, have no patience with those who say we shall not be fit for political reform until we reform our social system. I fail to see any connection between the two. Let me take, for instance, one of the political reforms which we have been suggesting year after year *viz*, the separation of Judicial from Executive functions in the same officer. What possible connection can there be between this, which is a purely political reform, and Social reform? In the same way, take the Permanent Settlement which we have been advocating, the amendment of the law relating to forests and other such measures;—and I ask again, what have these to do with Social Reforms? Are we not fit for them because our widows remain unmarried and our girls are given in marriage earlier than in other countries? because our wives and daughters do not drive about with us visting our friends? because we do not send our daughters to Oxford or Cambridge? (*Cheers*).

It is now my sorrowful duty to officially announce to you that death has been busy amongst the ranks of Congress men during the year just passed. Standing on this platform and speaking in this city, one feels almost an overpowering sense of despair when one finds that the familiar figure and the beloved face of Pandit Ajoodhianath is no more. We mourned for him when he died,

we have mourned for him since; and those of us who had the privilege of knowing him intimately, of perceiving his kindly heart, his great energy, his great devotion to the Congress cause, and the sacrifices he made for that cause, will mourn for him to the last. With Pandit Ajudhianath has passed away that other great Congress leader, Mr. George Yule. These were the two most prominent figures in the Congress held in this city in 1888: Pandit Ajudhianath as the Chairman of the Reception Committee; Mr. Yule as the President of the Congress. It was my singular good fortune to have been the means of inducing both these gentlemen to espouse the Congress Cause. I was here in April, 1887, and met Pandit Ajudhianath, who had not then expressed his views, one way or another, with regard to Congress matters. I discussed the matter with him. He listened to me with his usual courtesy and urbanity, and he pointed out to me certain defects which he thought existed in our system; and, at last, after a sympathetic hearing of over an hour and a half, he told me he would think of all I had said to him, and that he would consider the matter carefully and thoroughly, and then let me know his views. I never heard anything from him from that time until on the eve of my departure for Madras to attend the Congress of 1887. I then received a letter from him in which he said I had made a convert of him to the Congress cause, that he had thoroughly made up his mind to join us, that he was anxious to go to Madras himself, but that illness prevented him from doing so, and he sent a message that if it pleased the Congress to hold its next Session at Allahabad in 1888, he would do all he could to make the Congress a success. And you know—certainly, those of you who attended know—what a success he did make of it. Our venerable President of the Reception Committee of this present Congress has told us the difficulties which had to be encountered to make that Congress a success, and I do not belittle his services or those of any other worthy Congressman who worked with him at that Congress, when I say that it was owing to Pandit Ajudhianath's exertions that that Congress was the success it was.

When it was time to select a President for recommendation to the Congress of 1888, it was suggested to me, I being then in England, that I might ascertain the views of Mr. George Yule, and ask him to preside. I accordingly saw him at his office in the City, and had the same kind of conversation with him as I had had, the year before, with Pandit Ajudhianath. He also listened to me kindly, courteously, and sympathetically and asked me to give him all the Congress literature I had. I had only the three Reports of the Congress meetings of 1885, 1886, and 1887, and I sent these to him; and to my great joy, and, as it afterwards turned out, to the great benefit of the Congress, Mr. Yule came to see me at my house and told me that he entirely sympathised with the cause, and that, if elected to be the President of the Congress of that year, he would be proud of the position and would do what he could for us. Those who had the good fortune to attend the Congress of 1888, know how manfully and how well he sustained the duties of his position; how he pointed out that the chief plank in the Congress platform—namely, the reform and reconstitution of the Legislative Councils of this country—was by no means an invention on

the part of the Congress; that that point had received the attention and had been favourably considered and spoken of by that marvellous English Statesman, Benjamin Disraeli, Earl of Beaconsfield. He told us that we were treading on the footsteps of that great man, and that if we perseveringly stuck to our colours, sometime or other we should get what we wanted. From that time to the day of his death, Mr. Yule worked with us, gave us his valuable advice and helped us considerably as regards our working expenses. Pandit Ajudhianath as you know, from the time he joined the Congress, worked early, worked late, worked with the old, worked with the young, never spared any personal sacrifices, so that he might do good to his country and to the Congress, and his lamented death came upon him when he was coming back from Nagpore, after having worked there for the success of the Nagpore Congress of last year. Those who ever so slightly knew Pandit Ajudhianath and Mr. Yule will never be able to forget the great services which those gentlemen rendered to the Congress cause.

From Madras we have the sad news of the death of Salem Ramaswami Moodeliar. He was an earnest worker and did yeoman service to the cause of his country. In 1885, he was one of a band of three who were deputed to go to Great Britain during the then general election: his colleagues being Mr. N. G. Chandravarkar of Bombay, and Mr. Monomohun Ghose of Calcutta, and these three devoted men vied with each other as to who could do the most work for the benefit of his country. Salem Ramaswami Moodeliar served on the Public Service Commission, and we all know the bitter disappointment he felt when the Secretary of State for India did not carry out what he had hoped he would; namely, accept the recommendation of the Public Service Commission as a whole. There were some recommendations of the Commission which Salem Ramaswami Moodeliar, and those who worked with him, did not approve; but in order that the recommendations of which they approved might be carried into effect, he and his colleagues gave in their adhesion to them, and all joined in signing the Report. I remember that the Report did not give any satisfaction to the country at large. We had discussions on the subject at the Congress of 1888, and some of us were very anxious that that report should be disavowed, and that we should, by a resolution, tell the Government that the recommendations of the Commission did not come up to our expectations at all. Salem Ramaswami Moodeliar advised us not to agitate the matter then, but wait until the Secretary of State's orders were out. If, he said, the Secretary of State accepted those recommendations the matter might well be allowed to rest for some years to come; but if he did not do so, then he, Ramaswami Moodeliar, would be the first to re-open the question and carry on the agitation to the end of his life, if necessary. He was a sagacious and courageous man, and in him the Congress has lost a leader of eminence and earnestness. In Madras we have also lost G. Mahadeo Chetty and Ramaswamy Naidu, both earnest Con, gress workers, and they will be missed by their Congress friends and acquaintances. In Bengal, we have had two heavy losses by the death of Prannath Pandit and Okhoy Coomar Dass. Prannath Pandit was the worthy son of a worthyfather,

the late Mr. Justice Sambhoonath Pandit—the first native gentleman who was appointed to the Bench of the High Court;—and though he died young he was of great service to his country and to our cause, and had he been spared he would have done still greater services. Okhoy Coomar Dass was a younger man still, but his energy was great, and as a public man he outshone many of his contemporaries in Lower Bengal. It was due to him that many abuses in our Courts of Justice were exposed, and it was due to him that Howrah owes its standing Congress Committee. We grieve for all these spirits who have passed away from us, and I would beg leave, on behalf of this Congress, to express to their respective families, our respective and reverential condolences in the great loss that has overtaken them. "Sorrow shared is sorrow soothed," says the old adage, and, if that be a fact, I have no doubt that our sympathy will go somewhat towards assuaging the grief of their families.

Gentlemen, I must now proceed to call your attention to subjects more exciting, though, with the exception of a couple of them, I am not in a position to say, they are more cheering. The first piece of cheering news I have is that Lord Cross's India Councils Bill, after delays which seemed to many of us to be endless, has at last passed through the Houses of Parliament and received the Royal assent. From what we have been able to gather from the speeches delivered by the Viceroy during his tour in Madras, it would seem that the Rules under which the Act is to be given effect to, are now under the consideration of the Government of India. We all know that the Act in terms does not profess to give us much, but it is capable, I believe, of infinite expansion under the Rules that are to be framed. If those Rules are framed in the spirit in which the present Prime Minister of England understood the Act was framed, and what he said was assented to by the then Under-Secretary of State for India, namely, that that the people of India were to have real living representation in their Legislative Council,—if those Rules are framed in the spirit of true statesmanship, statesmanship such as one would have confidently expected from Sir Thomas Munro, Mountstuart Elphinstone, Lord William Bentinck and a host of other distinguished Anglo-Indian statesmen who have made British India what she is,—I have no doubt we shall all be glad to put away the first plank in our Congress platform, namely, the reform and reconstitution of the Legislative Councils. The spirits that seem to be abroad just now in this country however do not seem to me to give a very hopeful augury as to these Rules. I am afraid that some of our rulers have been possessed with the idea that we have been progressing too fast. It is a great pity that this should be so. But if these rules do not come up to our expectations, gentlemen, we must go on with our agitation and not stop until we get what we all think and we all believe, and, what is more, what our rulers themselves have taught us to believe, we have a right to get. (*Cheers*).

Another cheering event to which I have to call attention is the return of our leader, our revered leader, Dadabhai Naoroji (*Three Cheers*) to sit in the House of Commons as member for Central Finsbury. You all know it had been hoped that he would be able to come out from England to occupy the position I am now

occupying. We all looked forward to his presence amongst us with hopefulness and trust and with great satisfaction, because, if he had been with us we could have shown to him, face to face, that our confidence in him is just as high as it ever was. We could have told him, by word of mouth, of the gréat joy which spread throughout the length and breadth of India when the news of his return to the House of Commons was received, if the anxiety with which we watched the fate of the election petition which was presented against his return, and how glad we were that it was at last withdrawn. And he could have carried back with him to England our message of gratitude to the electors of Central Finsbury (*Cheers*), and have shown them that in electing him as their representative they had also elected a representative for the people of India in the House of Commons. (*Cheers*). Unfortunately, his opponent, Captain Penton, had presented that hateful petition and just at the moment that Mr. Naoroji was to have made his preparations to come out to India, it was fixed to be heared. Mr. Naoroji had to stay. There was a hand to hand struggle, and it was at last found that the number of votes for the two candidates was on a level. Captain Penton must have felt that if he went on any further his number might come down, and then Mr. Naoroji would retain his seat and Captain Penton would have to pay all the costs. He thought discretion the better part of valour, and prudently withdrew his petition, each party paying his own costs, and the seat of Mr. Naoroji is now perfectly safe. And as long as this present Parliament lasts he will remain our member (*Cheers*), and we shall get all the help it is possible for him to give us, in the cause of Indian reforms. But we must not expect too much from him. He is but one in a House of 670 members, and though he will do for us all that prudence, good sense, vast knowledge and great eloquence can do, yet he is single-handed. To be strong, he must receive all the support he can from this country, and backed by that support he may be able to put our case convincingly before the House. But, what we really want is not that our country men generally should sit in the House of Commons. Englishmen themselves find it extremely hard to find seats there, how much more must we who are "black men." What we want and have a right to get is that our country men should have the opportunity of really representing to the Government the views of the people of this country in this country. What we want is that there should be responsible Government in India. I have always felt that the one great evil of the Indian administration is that our rulers are responsible to no one outside of their own consciences. That they conscientiously endeavour to do what they can for the good Government of our country, may be accepted as an undeniable fact and accepted with gratitude. But it is not enough that our rulers should only be responsible to their own consciences. After all they are human beings, with human frailties, and human imperfections. It is necessary that they should be responsible to those over whom they have been placed by Providence to rule. (*Cheers*). In making these observations I have not lost sight of the fact that the Government of India, in India, is responsible to the Government of India, in Westminster, and that the Government of India in Westminster

is responsible to the Cabinet of the day, of which he is invariably one of the members. Nor have I forgotten that the Cabinet of the day is responsible to the House of Commons. But when you come to consider what this responsibility really is, I think, you will all agree with me that I have not overstated the case in the slightest degree. Unless the Secretary of State for India happen to be a personage of exceptional force of character and of great determination, such as the late Prime Minister proved to be when he was in charge of the India Office, he generally, to use Burke's language, says "ditto" to the Government of India in India. The Cabinet is so troubled with the affairs of the vast British Empire that the members really have no time to devote to India as a body, and leave her to their colleague the Secretary of State for India. When any Indian question comes before the House of Commons, what do we see? The Cabinet of the day has always a majority in the House, and it always finds supporters among its own party, whether they are would-be placemen or whether they are country gentlemen who go to the House of Commons as the best club in England. (*Cheers*). And in non-party matters—and they make t a pretence in the House of Commons to regard Indian affairs as matters non-party,—in all non-party matters, the Government of the day can always rely upon a large amount of support from the opposition. (*Hear, Hear*). There are a few members of the House of Commons who make it a point to devote a portion of their time and energies to the consideration of Indian questions. But they are only a few; they have hardly any following; and if they press any matters on the attention of the House, with any degree of zeal, they are voted down as bores by the rest of the House of Commons. (*Hear, Hear*). Of course the case of Mr. Bradlaugh (*Cheers*) was entirely different. He was a most masterful man, and by his mastery over his fellowmen, he attained the position for himself which he occupied in the House of Commons at the time of his death. There are but few in England like Mr. Bradlaugh. I am sorry to say that since the death of that great man we have not been able to find one who possesses his capacity, possesses his knowledge, or possesses the influence which he exercised over the House of Commons. Therefore, when you consider what the responsibility of the Government of India is to the Government of England and the House of Commons, you will not, I think, be able to come to any other conclusion than that it is *nil*. (*Hear, Hear*).

By the reconstitution of the Legislative Councils on lines that would allow representatives of the people to be elected to these Councils, the Government would be face to face with them. They would know, at first hand, what the real feelings and the real grievances of the people are. (*Hear, Hear*). They would then be able to devise measures which would be in consonance with the feelings of the people, and which would get rid of their grievances. At present, *modus operandi* is this. A Secretary thinks that a particular measure ought to be passed, and it may be taken that he honestly believes that the measure would be for the benefit of the country. He invites two or three Indian gentlemen of eminence, with whom he is acquainted, to see him. He speaks to them in private, and gets their views, which, unfortunately, in the case of these Indian gentlemen, generally coincide with the

views he himself holds. (*Laughter*). The measure is passed. There is a great cry of indignation in the country. The answer of the Government is,—"Oh, but we consulted the leaders of your society, and it is with their help this measure has been passed." I hold that the time has passed for this sort of statesmanship. If the Government make a real effort to arrive at what the views of the country and people generally are, I have no doubt that they will be able so to shape their policy as to give satisfaction to all concerned. This, to my mind is the chief thing that we need. (*Hear, Hear*). In the Councils our representatives will be able to inter pellate the Government with regard to their policy and the mode in which that policy is being given effect to. My conviction is, that the weal and woe of our country is not so much dependent upon the Viceroy or the Local Governor, however sympathetic and kind, but upon the officials who have to administer the law and come in contact with the people. Until there is the right of interpellation granted to us in our own Councils, there will be no true reponsibility on the part of our Government. I repeat that those who are placed over us, our Viceroys, Governors, Lieutenant Governors and others of lesser degree, are more or less actuated by the desire to do us good, both for their own case as well as for the sake of the people of the country ; but the system under which they work is a vicious one, and the result is, no good is really done (*Cheers.*)

Now, Gentlemen, while a Conservative Government has given us this India Councils Bill, and a Radical constituency has sent one of our countrymen to the House of Commons, showing in the first instance some, and in the second, a great amount of liberality, here in this country, we have had in a neighbouring province a policy adopted which has made a painfully profound sensation over the whole of this vast empire—a sensation which it will take a very long time to allay. In the first place, though we, in this Congress, and the country generally, have been pressing and pressing and pressing the Government not to take away the grants for education but to increase those grants, so far as the provinces of Bengal and Bombay are concerned, grants in aid of high education have been doomed. Government require, they say, money for primary education ; they do not wish to spend money upon high education. I am not one of those who believe that primary education is not required. I think, it is as much required as high education. But I confess, I do not understand for a moment why it is necessary to starve high education in order that primary education may be provided for and protected. (*Cheers*). Government ought to foster education of all kinds alike ; it ought to spend its resources upon every kind of education (*Renewed Cheers*) for the people ; not only primary education but technical education of all kinds, and also high education. It is said,—"you who have had, and who appreciate, high education ought to maintain it yourselves." I know of no other country in which such a thing as this has been said by the Government to the people they rule over. It is one of the first duties of the Government to educate the people just as it is their duty to protect them from thieves and robbers. (*Cheers*). If they tell the people to-day—" Go and educate yourselves," why should they not tell them to-morrow—" You are rich and can

afford to keep durwans. Go and protect yourselves against thieves and robbers, we will not do so." (*Cheers*).

But the sensation, to which I have referred, is one not so much due to the doings of our Bengal and Bombay Governments as regards high education, as to the notification which the Lieutenant-Governor of Bengal has lately issued, withdrawing trial by Jury in serious cases from the seven Districts in Bengal, where the system of trial by Jury has been in existence for some years. (*Cries of "Shame"*). The plea, upon which this notification has been based, is that trial by Jury has been a failure as a means for the repression of crime. (*Cries of Shame, and no, no*). Can it be said that if a Sessions Judge trying a case with the assistance of Assessors and without the assistance of a Jury acquit a prisoner, that he is a failure as a means for the repression of crime? If that cannot be said with regard to Sessions Judges, with what justice can it be said in regard to Juries? (*Cheers*). Those of us who have had any acquaintance with the subject, have long felt that the administration of Criminal Justice in this country has been extremely unsatisfactory. There has not been much said about it, because it affects people, the majority of whom are poor men—men who cannot make much noise. They submit to what takes place, grumble among their fellows and cry *kismut*. Now let us see how the matter stands. While in Civil cases the evidence is taken down in the language in which the witness gives it, by an officer specially appointed for the purpose, and in appeals the evidence thus taken down is made the basis of the judgment of the Appellate Court where it differs from the notes of the Judge, in Criminal cases the evidence is, as a rule, taken down by the presiding officer in English. Most of these presiding officers are gentlemen who come to us here from Great Britain. They, no doubt, try and learn the languages of the people they are sent out to govern, but the circumstances, in which they are placed, and the circumstances in which the people of this country are placed, are such that they are compelled to live in utter isolation from one another. You may read the books of a country, you may know its literature well, but unless you have a familiar acquaintance with the people of the country, unless you have mixed familiarly with them, it is impossible for you to understand the language these people speak. Why is there so much outcry about what is called "Babu English."? Many Babus, and in this designation I include my countrymen from all parts of India, know English Literature better, I make bold to say, than many educated men in England (*Cheers*). They know English better and English Literature better than many Continental English scholars. They know English History, as well, if not better, than Englishmen themselves. Why is it then that when they write English, when they speak English, they sometimes make grievous blunders? Why is it then that their composition is called stilted? Because their knowledge is derived from books only and not from contact with the people of England. If an English gentleman were to write a book or write a letter, in the vernacular with which he is supposed to be most familiar, I am afraid his composition would bear a great family likeness to "Babu English." It would be "English Vernacular." It would

contain grammatical mistakes which would even shame our average school boy. Let an English gentleman, thoroughly acquainted with the vernacular of a district, speak to a native of that district. His pronunciation would be such that the native, even if educated, would find it difficult to understand him. It is gentlemen of this description who hear country-people, called as witnesses before them, give their evidence in the vernacular. How is it possible for them to understand them correctly? How much do you think of what these witnesses say to the Judge is taken down correctly and finds a place in the Judge's notes? (*Little or nothing*).

And when an appeal is preferred to the Appellate Court, it is this evidence, and this evidence alone, upon which the Judges of that Court have to act. When the District Judge tries a Civil case, he has the plaint and written statement translated for him into English by his clerk. The evidence given before him is, as a rule, interpreted to him by the pleaders on either side. But when the same District Judge acts in his capacity as Sessions Judge and presides over Criminal trials, he, as a rule, takes down the evidence, without the aid of interpreters, in English, and he charges the Jury, in Jury cases, in the vernacular of the country. (*Laughter*). The Indian Penal Code has been translated into all the vernaculars of the country, and those who know these languages and who know English, I think, are agreed, that it is extremely difficult to make out what the vernacular Penal Code means; and charging the Jury in the vernacular means, that the Judges have to explain the Penal Code to them in the vernacular—a superhuman task almost! Again, while in Civil cases pleaders, and particularly pleaders of position are allowed a free hand as regards cross-examination, in Criminal cases, particularly in cases where the accused is unable to employ pleaders of eminence, but is compelled to have either junior pleaders or mukhters, the cross-examination of the witnesses may be said almost to be a farce. The presiding officer gets impatient in a very short time, cuts short the cross-examination at his own sweet will and pleasure and in many cases most important facts are not elicited in consequence. (*Hear, Hear*). While in Civil appeals, you, as a rule, get a patient hearing, the argument sometimes lasting for days, just think, those of you who have any experience of these Courts, what takes place when Criminal appeals are heard by Sessions Judges in the moffussil! They are often taken up at the fag end of the day and listened to with impatience, and then is asked the almost invariable question, as the Judge, after hearing the appeal for a few minutes, is about to rise for the day,—"Have you any thing more to say; I will read the papers for myself and give the decision to-morrow." The Judge rises, and the poor man's appeal is over. Some appeals are dismissed and some, though this is more rare, are allowed. Again, while in Civil cases there is hardly any fear of their being decided on facts outside the record, in Criminal cases there is the greatest fear that outside influence is brought to bear upon the presiding officer. The thing is inevitable when you consider that the District Magistrate is the real head of the Police of the district, and that all officers trying Criminal cases, except the Sessions Judge, are subordinate to him and depend on him for promotion; and as regards the Sessions Judges themselves,

they may, by the system which has now been introduced of dividing the Civil Service into two branches, find themselves independent of the District Magistrate one day and his subordinate the next, during the time he oscillates as acting Sessions Judge and Joint Magistrate, as not unoften happens. Again, in Civil cases we have the right of appeal as of course, and, if they are of sufficient value of appealing to Her Majesty in Council; in Criminal cases we have to apply for leave, to appeal and have our appeal only from the Sessions Judge to the High Court, and from the inferior judiciary to the Sessions Judge, and in some cases to the District Magistrates. There are many other points to which attention may be called but I think I have said enough to convince those who are not familiar with the matter, that I was right when I said that the administration of Criminal justice in this country was most unsatisfactory. (*Cheers*). The only safeguard which accused persons have against this system in Sessions cases, is trial by jury. (*Hear, Hear*). And now the notification of the Lieutenant-Governor of Bengal withdraws this safeguard from the seven districts in Bengal where it existed, and the whole of India has been threatened with a like withdrawal. (*Cries of* "*Shame*".) The question is not a provincial but an imperial one, and of the highest importance. I therefore think, it is our duty to take this question up and help our Bengal brethren to the utmost extent of our power to get back what they have lost, and to see that other parts of the country are not overtaken by the same fate. (*Hear, Hear*).

Let us for the moment consider, what is the meaning of "trial by Jury having failed as a means for the repression of crime." One of the learned Judges of the Calcutta High Court who was consulted upon this matter, I refer to Mr. Justice Beverly, said that he did not think that a person bent upon committing a crime would stop to think whether, if he was detected, he would be tried by a Judge with a jury or tried by a Judge with the aid of Assessors. (*Loud Cheers*). Judges and Juries do not sit to repress crime but to ascertain if crime has been committed, and if the Jury find that crime has been committed, the Judge punishes the offender. (*Cheers*). It is the duty of the police to see that crime is not committed, and when, in spite of their vigilance, crime is committed, to bring the offender to justice. In this country, where unfortunately the police are not over-scrupulous as to how they get up cases, Trial by Jury is the most essential safeguard against injustice. Jurymen being drawn from the people themselves are better able to understand the language in which witnesses give their evidence, better able to understand and appreciate the demeanour of witnesses—the twists and turns in their answers, the rolling of their eyes, the scratching of their heads, and various other contortions of their physiognomy which witnesses go through to avoid giving straight answers to straight questions—than the Judge upon whom, unless he be an officer of exceptional and brilliant talents, they are lost. (*Hear, Hear*). A former Lieutenant-Governor of Bengal, himself a Sessions Judge of large experience, and, therefore, able to speak with authority on the subject—I allude to the late Sir A. Rivers Thompson,—said

in regard to Jurymen, that they were more scrupulous in accepting police evidence than the Judges were, and that it was quite right that it should be so. The Law allows Sessions Judges to make references to the High Court if they differ from the verdict of a Jury. These references come up before the High Court, and the learned Judges of that Court have before them only the evidence recorded in English by the Sessions Judge, the evidence recorded in the Court of the Committing Magistrate and the Judge's charge. Though they may be men of brilliant talents, men of great experience, men of great conscientiousness, I still venture to think that it is impossible for them—human beings as they are—reading merely the dry bones of the evidence placed before them upon paper, to come to a correct conclusion as to whether the Judge was right or the Jury were right. (*Cheers*). If they heard the evidence given by the witnesses in their presence, their conclusion would no doubt be accepted as more satisfactory, and if they differed from the Jury it might be that the Jury were wrong, but under the present system how can that be done? How can it be said, that when they accept the opinion of the Sessions Judges the Sessions Judges are right and the Jury wrong? And in many of these references, the High Courts, have accepted the verdict of the Jury and differed from the recommendation of the Judge. (*Cheers*). The only ground for saying that the system of trial by Jury has failed is, as I understand, that the High Court has in some instances differed from them, and adopted the recommendation of the Sessions Judge. I have told you, it is impossible—regard being had to the limitation of human nature—to say with confidence, who was right and who was wrong; but assuming that the Jury were wrong in many instances, and that they had given improper verdicts, what is the consequence? A few more persons who would have been in jail are now free men. What then? Has there been any complaint on the part of the people of these seven districts, that they went about in fear of their lives, because by the obstinacy and perversity of Jurymen, accused persons who ought to have been condemned to death had been set free? (*Hear, Hear*). Did any one say, that he or she regarded the system with disfavour or dislike or fear? Had any one suggested, that the system should be abolished? I say emphatically, No! No complaint reached the Government from the people affected, that the system had failed. It is the overflowing desire on the part of the Government to do good to us that has been the cause of the withdrawal of this system! Save us from our well-wishers, say I. (*Loud Cheers*). I could have understood the action of Government if there had been any hue and cry in the country on the subject. I could have understood it, if any representation had come from those affected to the Government; but under the circumstances this bolt from the blue I do not understand and cannot appreciate. (*Loud Applause*). It is said that, trial by Jury is foreign to this country. We who have cherished our Punchayet system for generations to be told that trial by Jury is foreign to us, to be told so at the fag end of the nineteenth century, why it is strange indeed! No, no, gentlemen—it was on our Punchayet system that Lord Cornwallis proceeded when in 1790 he ruled that we should have trial by Jury. It was on

that system that Sir Thomas Munro based his regulation which his successor promulgated in 1827. It was on that system that the Bombay regulation on the subject was introduced, and when these regulations were codified in 1861, it was on that system the law was based. We must have the system extended to the whole country and not withdrawn from any part of it, and we must therefore join together and agitate on the subject from one end of India to the other, and say, that this notification, which has given rise to so much discontent, was not required, and that it should be withdrawn, and withdrawn as speedily as possible, and the policy of which it is the outcome reversed. (*Loud Applause*).

I am afraid gentlemen, I have detained you longer than I should have done. (*Cries of*, " *No, No and go on* "). I have but a few more words to say, and these I shall say as briefly as I can. I said at the outset, that the Congress movement has been a great success, but it behoved us all to make it even a greater success than it is. During the Jury agitation in Bengal I was greatly pained, more pained than I can describe, by one of the apologists of the Government saying openly in his paper, that the agitation against the Jury notification was of no account because it was only a " native " agitation and that no Europeans had joined it. As a matter of fact, I know from personal knowledge that a great many very respectable and independent gentlemen in Calcutta joined the movement and cordially sympathised with it. But supposing it had been otherwise ? This same apologist has, day after day, pointed out that the withdrawl of trial by Jury, in these seven Bengal districts, in serious cases, does not in any way touch Europeans or European British Subjects. If he is right in this, it is a matter of no surprise that Europeans have not joined the movement. But because Europeans have not joined the movement, is a movement of the people of this country to be despised ? Is our voice not to be listened to, because, forsooth, to that voice has not been added the voice of our European fellow-subjects ? (*Hear, Hear, and Cheers*). We would welcome, welcome with open arms, all the support which we can get from our European fellow-subjects. I believe, that so far as the non-official Europeans are concerned, their interests and ours, in this country, are the same ; we all desire that there should be a development of the resources of the country and that there should be enough for all who are here, whether for a time or in perpetuity. (*Hear, Hear*). But apart from that, why is our voice to be despised ? It is we who feel the pinch ; it is we who have to suffer, and when we cry out, it is said to us, " O ! we cannot listen to you ; yours is a contemptible and useless and a vile agitation, and we will not listen to you. " Time was when we natives of the country agitated about any matter, with the help of non-official Europeans, the apologists of the Government used to say triumphantly, " this agitation is not the agitation of the natives of the country, but has been got up by a few discontented Europeans ; don't listen to them, it is not their true voice ; it is the voice of these Europeans. " But now we are told, " don't listen to them, it is their own voice and not the voice of the Europeans. " (*Shame*). It is sad that such reflections should be published by responsible journalists pretending to be in the confidence of our rulers. I hope and confidently

trust that these are not the sentiments by which any administration in India is actuated. I hope and trust that when we make respectful representations to the Government, they will be considered on their own merits, whether we are joined in our agitation by our European fellow-subjects or whether we stand by ourselves; and in order that these representations of ours, not only on the Jury question but on other questions which touch us, may succeed, it is necessary that we, in our Congress, should work and work with a will. It is not enough that you should come from long distances and be present at the annual sittings of the Congress. It is necessary, when you go back to your respective Provinces and districts, that you should display the same zeal and interest there. It has been the habit to leave the whole of the Congress work to the Secretary. We go back to our districts and sleep over it and leave the Secretary to do all he can for the business, in the shape of getting money, and then when it is time for the sessions to be held, we put on our best clothes, pack up our trunks and go But that is not work. Let us all on our parts act zealously and make sacrifices: without money it is impossible to be successful in anything. Let each of us go back and help our respective Secretaries; let us try and get as much money as we can for the success of the cause. (*Hear, hear*).

You all know that our cause has the support of some distinguished men in England, who form, what is called the Congress Committee in England. They are willing to give us their services unstintingly, ungrudgingly, but you cannot expect them to give their services to us at their own expense. You cannot expect that the necessary expenses required for the hiring of rooms, for the printing of papers, for the despatch of telegrams and all other things necessary for carrying on the great cause, shall be paid out of their own pockets. We must do our best to support them; we must do our best to support the cause; and if we are true to ourselves, if we are true to our principles, if we are true to our country, be assured that in the fulness of time all that you require from the benign Government of the British nation, all that you seek from them to make you true citizens, will be given to you by that nation. (*Loud and prolonged applause*).

Ninth Congress—Lahore—1893.

Mr. Dadabhai Naoroji M. P.

LADIES AND GENTLEMEN.—I need not say how deeply I feel the honour you have done me by electing me a second time to preside over your deliberations. I thank you sincerely for this honour. In the performance of the onerous duties of this high position I shall need your great indulgence and support, and I have no doubt that I shall receive them. (*Applause.*)

I am much pleased that I have the privilege of presiding at the very first Congress held in Punjab, as I had at Calcutta in 1886. I have taken, as you may be aware, some interest in the material condition of Punjab. In my first letter to the Secretary of State for India in 1880 on the material condition of India I took Punjab for my illustration, and worked out in detail its total annual income and the absolute wants of its common labourer. As to the loyalty of the Punjabis—Hindus, Sikhs, or Muhammadans—it has proved true through the most fiery ordeal on a most trying and critical occasion. (*Applause.*)

The occasion of this session of the Congress in Punjab has been a most happy coincidence. On Punjab rests a double responsibility—one external and one internal. If ever that hated threatened invasion of the Russians comes on, Punjab will have to bear the first brunt of the battle, and contented under British rule, as I hope India will be, Punjab will fight to her last man in loyalty and patriotism—loyalty to the British power, and patriotism to protect the hearths and homes of her beloved country of India. (*Loud applause.*)

The internal responsibility which at present rests upon the Punjabis and other warrior races of India is this. I have always understood and believed that manliness was associated with love of justice, generosity and intellect. So our British tutors have always taught us and have always claimed for themselves such character. And I cannot understand how any one could or should deny to your and other manly races of India the same characteristics of human nature. But yet we are gravely told that on the contrary the manliness of these races of India is associated with meanness, unpatriotic selfishness, and inferiority of intellect, and that therefore, like the dog in the manger, you and the other warrior races will be mean enough to oppose the resolution about Simultaneous Examinations, and unpatriotic and selfish enough to prevent the general progress of all India. ("*Shame.*")

Can offence and insult to a people, and that people admitted to be a manly people, go any further? Look at the numbers of Punjabis studying in England. Now this happy coincidence of this meeting in Punjab: you, considering every son of India as an Indian and a compatriot, have invited me—not a Punjabi, not a Muhammadan, nor a Sikh—from a distance of thousands of miles to enjoy the honour

of presiding over this Congress, and with this gathering from all parts of India as the guests of the Punjabis, you conclusively, once for all and for ever, set the matter at rest that the Punjabis with all other Indians do earnestly desire the Simultaneous Examinations as the only method in which justice can be done to all the people of India, as this Congress has repeatedly resolved. And, moreover, Punjab has the credit of holding the very first public meeting in favour of the Resolution passed by the House of Commons for Simultaneous Examinations. *(Cheers.)*

When I use the words English or British, I mean all the peoples of the United Kingdom.

It is our melancholy duty to record the loss of one of our greatest patriots, Justice Kasinath Trimbak Telang. It is a heavy loss to India; you all know what a high place he held in our estimation for his great ability, learning, eloquence, sound judgment, wise counsel and leadership. I have known him and worked with him for many years, and I have not known any one more earnest and devoted to the cause of our country's welfare. He was one of the most active founders of this Congress, and was its first hard-working Secretary in Bombay. From the very first he had taken a warm interest and active part in our work, and even after he became a Judge his sound advice was always at our disposal.

I am glad Mr. Mahadhev Govind Ranade is appointed in his place. *(Cheers.)* It does much credit indeed to Lord Harris for the selection, and I am sure Mr. Ranade will prove himself worthy of the post. I have known him long, and his ability and learning are well known. *(Applause.)* His sound judgment and earnest work in various ways have done valuable services to the cause of India. *(Applause.)*

I am also much pleased that an Indian, Mr. Pramada Charan Bannerji, succeeds Mr. Justice Mahmud at Allahabad. *(Cheers.)*

I feel thankful to the Local Governments and the Indian Government for such appointments, and to Lord Kimberley for his sanction of them among which I may include also the decision about the Sanskrit Chair at Madras. *(Applause.)* I feel the more thankful to Lord Kimberley, for I am afraid, and I hope I may be wrong, that there has been a tendency of not only not loyally carrying out the rule about situations of Rs. 200 and upwards to be given to Indians, but that even such posts as have been already given to them are being snatched away from their hands. Lord Kimberley's firmness in not allowing this is therefore so much the more worthy of praise and our thankfulness.

Lord Kimberley also took prompt action to prevent the retrograde step in connection with the Jury system in Bengal for which Mr. Paul and other friends interested themselves in Parliament; and also to prevent the retrograde interference with the Chairmanship of Municipalities, at the instance of our British Committee in London. I do hope that in the same spirit Lord Kimberley will consider our representations about the extension of the Jury system.

Before proceeding further, let me perform the gratifying task of communi-

cating to you a message of sympathy and goodwill which I have brought for you from Central Finsbury. (*Loud applause and three cheers for the electors of Central Finsbury.*) On learning that I had accepted your invitation to preside, the Council of the Central Finsbury United Liberal and Radical Association passed a Resolution, which I have now the pleasure of placing before you, signed by Mr. Joseph Walton, the Chairman, and forwarded to me by the Honorary Secretary, Mr. R. M. H. Griffith, one of my best friends and supporters.

The Central Finsbury United Liberal and Radical Association, in view of Mr. Naorojis' visit to India at the end of November next, have passed the following Resolution:—

"1. That the General Council of the Central Finsbury United Liberal and Radical Association desire to record their high appreciation of the admirable and most exemplary manner in which Mr. Dadabhai Naoroji has performed his duties as representative of this constituency in the House of Commons, and, learning that he is, in the course of a few months, to visit India to preside over the Ninth Session of the Indian National Congress, request him to communicate to that body an expression of their full sympathy alike with all the efforts of that Congress for the welfare of India, and with the Resolution which has been recently passed by the House of Commons (in the adoption of which Mr. Dadabhai Naoroji has been so largely instrumental) in favour of holding Simultaneous Examinations in India and in Britain of candidates for all the Indian Civil Services, and further express the earnest hope that full effect will, as speedily as possible, be given by the Government to this measure of justice which has been already too long delayed' (*Applause.*)

"2. That a copy of this resolution be forwarded to Mr. Dadabhai Naoroji.

"(Signed) JOSEPH WALTON,

"*Chairman of Meeting.*"

The Resolution has been sent to Mr. Naoroji with an accompanying letter, which says.

"Central Finsbury United Liberal and Radical Association,
"20, St. John Street Road, Clerkenwell,
London, E.C

"DEAR SIR,—I have been directed to forward to you the enclosed copy of Resolution passed at the last meeting of the Council of this Association.

"Joining in the hope of my colleagues that the result of our efforts may be of material and lasting good, and wishing you a fruitful journey, with a speedy return to us the constituents you so worthily represent in Parliament,

"I am, yours faithfully,
"R. M. H. GRIFFITHS,
"*Honorary Secretary.*"

"The Honourable DADABHAI NAOROJI, M. P.,
"House of Commons, Westminister.

"*August 1893.*"

The fact is, and it stands to reason, that the thinking portion and the educated, whether in English or in their own learning, of all classes and creeds, in their common nationality as Indians, are naturally becoming the leaders of the people. Those Indians, specially, who have received a good English education, have the double advantage of knowing their own countrymen as well as understanding and appreciating the merits of British men and British rule, with the result, as Sir Bartle

Frere has well put it: "And now wherever I go I find the best exponents of the policy of the English Government, and the most able co-adjutors in adjusting that policy to the peculiarities of the Natives of India, among the ranks of the educated Natives." *(applause.)*

Or as the Government of India has said: "To the minds of at least the educated among the people of India—and the number is rapidly increasing—any idea of the subversion of the British power is abhorent." *(Hear, Hear.)* Government of India's Despatch, dated 8th June 1880, to Secretary of State for India.

And as Lord Dufferin, as Viceroy of India, has said in his Jubilee Speech: "We are surrounded on all sides by Native gentlemen of great attainments and intelligence, from whose hearty, loyal and honest co-operation we may hope to derive the greatest benefit." *(applause.)*

It would be the height of unwisdom, after themselves creating this great new force, "which is rapidly increasing" as "the best exponents and co-adjutors," as "abhoring the subversion of the British power," and from whose "hearty, loyal and honest co-operation the greatest benefit can arise," that the Ruling authorities should drive this force into opposition instead of drawing it to their own side by taking it into confidence and thereby strengthening their own foundation. This Congress represents the Aristocracy of intellect and the New Political Life, created by themselves, which is at present deeply grateful to its Creator. Commonsense tells you—have it with you, instead of against you.

With regard to your other most important Resolution, to hold examinations simultaneously both in India and England for all the Civil Services, it would not have become a practical fact by the Resolution of the House of Commons of 2nd June last had it not been to a large extent for your persevering but constitutional demand for it made with moderation during all the years of your existence. *(applause.)* I am glad that in the last Budget debate the Under-Secretary of State for India has given us this assurance.

"It may be in the recollection of the House that, in my official capacity, it was my duty earlier in the Session to oppose a Resolution in favor of Simultaneous Examinations, but the House of Commons thought differently from the Government That once done, I need hardly say that there is no disposition on the part of the Secretary of State for India or myself to attempt to thwart or defeat the effect of the vote of the House of Commons, on that resolution. *(Hear, Hear and applause.)* *Debates. Vol. XVII., 1893, p. 1835.*

We all cannot but feel thankful to the Secretary of State, Lord Kimberley and the Under-Secretary of State, Mr. George Russell, for this satisfactory assurance.

I may just remark here in passing that I am not able to understand why the higher Civil and Educational Medical Services are handed over to Military Medical Officers, instead of there being a separate Civil Medical Service, dealt with by Simultaneous Examinations in India and England, as we expect to have for the other Civil Services. I also may ask why some higher Civil Engineering posts are given to Military Engineers.

One thing more I may say: Your efforts have succeeded not only in creating an interest in Indian affairs, but also a desire among the people of the United Kingdom to promote our true welfare. (*Hear, Hear.*) Had you achieved in the course of the past eight years only this much and no more, you would have amply justified your existence. (*Cheers.*) You have proved two things—that you are moderate and reasonable in what you ask, and that the British people are willing to grant what is shown to be reasonable.

It is not necessary for me to enlarge upon the subject of your justification further than this, that all the Resolutions you have formulated have more or less advanced: that they are receiving attentive consideration is testified by the continuous discussions that have been going on in the press and on the platform both here and in England. In England itself many a cause, great or small, has to agitate long before making an impression. What struggles have there been in Parliament itself and out of Parliament for the Corn Laws, Slavery Laws, Factory Laws, Parliamentary Reforms, and many others, in short, in every important Legislation? We must keep courage, persevere, and "never say die." (*Loud applause.*)

One more result, though not the least, of your labours, I shall briefly touch upon. The effect which your labours produced on the minds of the people of the United Kingdom has helped largely an Indian to find his way into the Great Imperial Parliament, and in confirmation of this, I need not go further than remind you of the generous action of Central Finsbury and the words of the Resolution of the Council of its United Liberal and Radical Association which I have already placed before you. (*Applause.*)

As you are all aware, though it was long my wish, my friend the Hon. Mr. Lal Mohan Ghose made the first attempt, and twice contested Deptford, with no little chances of success, but adverse circumstances proved too strong for him. We owe a debt of gratitude to Deptford, and also to Holborn, which gave me the first lift, and in my contest there, though a forlorn hope, the Liberal electors exerted their utmost, and gave me a very satisfactory poll. (*Cheers.*)

My mind also turns to those good friends of India—Bright, Fawcett, Bradlaugh and others, (*Applause*)—who pioneered for us, prepared for the coming of this result, and helped us when we were helpless.

This naturally would make you desire and lead me to say a few words about the character of the reception given to the Indian Member in the House of Commons. It was everything that could be desired. (*Cheers.*) The welcome was general from all sides, as the interest in Indian affairs has been much increasing, and there is a desire to do justice to India. (*Renewed cheering.*) Mr. Gladstone on two occasions not only expressed his satisfaction to me at finding an Indian in the House, but expressed also a strong wish to see several more.

The attendance on Indian questions has been good, and what is still better, the interest in the Indian debates has been earnest, and with a desire to understand and judge rightly. India has indeed fared well this Session, notwithstanding its other unprecedentedly heavy work.

Thankful as we are to many Members of all sides, I am bound to express our special thanks to the Irish, Labour and Radical Members. (*Loud cheers.*) I heard from Mr. Davitt, two days before my departure, "Don't forget to tell your colleagues at the Congress that every one of Ireland's Home Rule Members in Parliament is at your back in the cause of the Indian People." (*Prolonged cheering.*) All our friends who had been working for us before are not only as zealous and staunch as ever, but more active and earnest. I cannot do better than to record in this place with thankfulness the names of all those Members from all parties who voted for the Resolution of 2nd June last in favour of Simultaneous Examinations in England and India for all the Indian Civil Services.*

As the ballot fell to Mr. Herbert Paul, (*Three cheers for Mr. Paul.*) he, as you are aware, moved the Resolution, and you know also how well and ably he advocated the cause, and has ever since kept up a watchful interest in and eye on it. I may mention here that I had sent a whip or notice to every Member of the House of Commons for this debate.

Motion made, and Question proposed, "That Mr. Speaker do now leave the Chair :"

Amendment proposed, to leave out from the word "That" to the end of the Question, in order to add the words "all open Competitive Examinations heretofore held in England alone for appointments to the Civil Services of India shall henceforth be held simultaneously both in India and England, such Examinations in both countries being identical in their nature, and all who compete being finally classified in one list according to merit :—(*Mr. Paul.*)

Question put, "That the words proposed to be left out stand part of the Question :"—

The House *divided* ; Ayes 76, Noes 84.

I may say here a few words about the progress we are making in our Parliamentary position. By the exertions of Sir William Wedderburn, (*Applause.*) Mr. Caine, (*Applause.*) and other friends, an Indian Parliamentary Committee has been formed, of which Sir William Wedderburn is the Chairman and Mr. Herbert Roberts is the Secretary. (*Applause.*) The Committee is not yet fully formed. It will, we hope, be a larger General Committee of our supporters with a small Executive Committee, like other similar Committees that exist in the House for other causes. I give the names of the Members now fully enrolled in this Committee :—Mr. Jacob Bright, Mr. Caine, Mr. John, E. Ellis, Dr. W. A. Hunter, Mr. Illingworth, Sir Wilfred Lawson, Mr. Walter B. McLaren, Mr. Swift MacNeill, Mr. Dadabhai Naoroji, Mr. H. Paul, Sir Joseph Pease, Mr. T. H. Roberts, Mr. R. T. Reid, Mr. Samuel Smith, Mr. C. E. Schwann, Mr. Eugene Wason, Mr. Webb, Sir W. Wedderburn.

Besides these, there are a large number of Members (exclusive of the 70 or 80 Irish Members already referred to) whom we count as supporters and hope to see fully enrolled Members on our Indian Parliamentary Committee before long.

On the eve of my departure, the committee invited me to a private dinner at

* The names are omitted.

the House, and gave me a hearty God-speed and wishes of success, with an expression of their earnest desire to see justice done to India. (*Applause*)

Before leaving this subject of Parliament, let me offer to Mr. George Russell, the Under-Secretary of State for India, my sincere thanks for his sympathetic and cordial treatment of me in all I had to do with him, and for his personal good feeling and kindness towards me. (*Applause.*)

With all that has been done by the Congress, we have only begun our work. We have yet much and very much more work to do till that political, moral and material condition is attained by us which will raise us really to the level of our British fellow-citizens in prosperity and political elevation, and thereby consolidate the British power on the imperishable foundation of justice, mutual benefit and the contentment and loyalty of the people.

The reason why I have dwelt upon our past life is that it shows that our future is promising and hopeful, that our faith in the instinctive love of justice and fair play of the people of the United Kingdom is not misplaced, and that if we are true to ourselves and learn from the British character the self-sacrifice and perseverance which the British so largely possess, we need never despair of obtaining every justice and reform which we may reasonably claim as our birthrights as British citizens. (*Cheers.*)

What then is to be our future work? We have yet to surmount much prejudice, prepossessions, and misapprehension of our true, material and political condition. But our course is clear and straight before us. On the one hand we need not despair or quarrel with those who are against us; we should on the other hand go on steadily, perseveringly and moderately with the representation of our grievances and just rights.

In connection with the question of our Legislative Councils we have yet very much work before us. Not only are the present rules unsatisfactory even for the fulfilment of the present Act itself as interpreted in the House by Mr. Gladstone not only have we yet to obtain the full "living representation" of the people of India in these Councils, but also much further extension of their present extremely restricted powers which render the Councils almost a mere name. By the Act of 1861 (19), without the permission of the Governor General no member can introduce any measure (which virtually amounts to exclusion) about matters affecting the public debt or public revenues or for imposing any charge on such revenue, or the discipline and maintenance of any part of Her Majesty's Military or Naval forces. This means that, as far as the spending of our money is concerned, the Legislative Council is simply as if it did not exist at all. (*Cries of "shame, shame."*) No motion can be made by any member unless such motion be for leave to introduce some measure or have reference to some measure actually introduced thereunto. Thus there is no opportunity of calling any Department or Government to account for their acts. (sec. 52). All things which shall be done by the Secretary of State shall have the same force and validity as if this Act (1861) had not been passed. Here is full arbitrary power. By the Act (1892

sec. 52) no member shall have power to submit or propose any resolution or to divide the Council in respect of any such financial discussion, or the answer to any question asked under the authority of this Act or the rules made under this Act. Such is the poor character of the extent of concession made to discuss finances or to put questions. Rules made under this Act (1892) shall not be subject to alteration or amendment at meetings for the purpose of making Laws and Regulations. Also (Act 1861, sec. 22) the Secretary of State for India can by an Act of Parliament raise any money in the United Kingdom for the Government of India, and thus pile up any amount of burden on the Indian taxpayer, without his having a word to say upon it. We are to all intents and purposes under an arbitrary rule, and are just only about at the threshold of a true Legislative Council.

Amongst the most important work of the Councils is the Budget. What is the condition of the Budget debate both here and in England? The House of Commons devotes week after week for supply of the English Budget, when every item of expenditure is discussed or may be altered; and not only that, but the conduct of the department during the year is brought under review, which becomes an important check to any arbitrary, unjust or illegal action. But what is the Indian Budget debate or procedure? Here the Financial Statement is made by the Finance Minister. Then a week or so after, a few speeches are made to no practial effect, no practical motion or resolution, and the whole thing is over. ("*Shame.*") Somewhat similar is the fate of the Indian Budget in the House of Commons, with the advantage of proposing any amendments and, at least, of having one amendment with practical effect of a division or vote. But there is also the important advantage of bringing in any Indian measure or motion in the course of the Session in accordance with the rules and orders of the House like any other measure or motion. I felt thankful that at the last Budget debate, though there was the usual additional agony of the last day of the Session, yet there was not also the agony of scanty attendance, thanks to the increasing interest in the House in Indian matters and to the friends of India. (*Applause.*) In both places no practical check on any waste, extravagant or unnecessary expenditure. I am not at present discussing the merits of such Councils and restriction of powers, but that such matters will require your attention and consideration, that even in this one matter of Legislative Councils you have yet to secure Mr. Gladstone's "real living representative voice of the people" being heard upon every detail of the Government of British India. (*Hear, hear.*)

There is, however, another important matter—I mean the direct representation from India in the Imperial Parliament. (*Applause.*) As all our Imperial questions and relations between India and the United Kingdom, all amendments of Parliamentary Acts already passed and existing, or all important Acts that may be and can be only passed hereafter in Parliament, and all our ultimate appeals can be settled in Parliament alone, it is of extreme importance that there should be some reasonable direct representation from India in the House of Commons, and the representatives may be Indians or Europeans as long as they are the choice

directly of Indian Constituencies, just as you have delegates to this Congress of Indians or Europeans.

Central Finsbury has been generous to us; other constituencies may also extend to us such generous consideration and help, but it is not fair that we should be left to depend upon the generosity of English Constituencies. (*Hear*, *hear*.) Under present circumstances we have a right to have direct representation. I hope the time is not very distant when we may successfully appeal to Parliament to grant us the true status of British political citizenship. (*Cheers*.) I do not overlook that several matters will have to be considered, and I am not at present placing before you a cut-and-dry scheme. My only object is to draw your attention to this vital subject.

But the greatest question before you, the question of all questions, is the Poverty of India. (*Hear*, *hear*.) This will be, I am much afraid, the great future trouble both of the Indian people and of the British Rulers. It is the rock ahead. In this matter we are labouring under one great disadvantage. This poverty we attribute to the system, and not to the officials who administer that system. (*Hear*, *hear and applause*.) But unfortunately for us, for themselves and the British people, the officials (with clear-sighted exceptions of course) make the matter personal, and do not consider impartially and with calmness of judgment this all-important subject. The present Duke of Devonshire has well put this state of the official mind, which is peculiarly applicable in connection with this subject. He said: "The Anglo-Indian, whatever may be his merits, and no doubt they are just, is not a person who is distinguished by an exceptionally calm judgment."—Speech, H. of C., 23rd August 1883.

Mr. Gladstone also lately, in the Opium debate, remarked :—"That it was a sad thing to say, but unquestionably it happens not infrequently in human affairs, that those who ought from their situation to know the most and the best, yet from prejudice and prepossessions knew the least and the worst." (*Hear*, *hear*.)

This has been our misfortune with officials. But there have been and are some thoughtful officials who know the truth, like Lord Lawrence and others in the past, and in the present times like the latest Finance Ministers, Lord Cromer, Sir Auckland Colvin and Sir David Barbour, who have perceived and stated the terrible truth that British India is extremely poor. Among other officials, several have testified to the sad fact, in "Confidential Reports," which Government do not publish—and this after a hundred years of the work of these officials under the present unnatural system. The system being unnatural, were the officials the very angels themselves, or as many Gladstones, they cannot prevent the evils of the system and cannot do much good. When Mr. Bayley and I moved for a Royal Commission of Inquiry, it was said that I had not produced evidence of poverty, it was not so; but it is difficult to make those see who would not see. (*Laughter and applause*.) To every member of the House I had previously sent my papers of all necessary evidence on the annual income and absolute wants of the people of India. I do not know whether any of those who opposed us had taken the trouble

to read this, and it was unfair to expect that in making out a *prima facie* case for our motion, I should reiterate, with the unnecessary waste of some hours of the precious time of the House, all the evidence already in their hands.

You remember my papers on the Poverty of India, and I have asked for Returns to bring up information to date, so that a fair comparison of the present with the past may enable the House to come to a correct judgment. I am sorry the Government of India refuses to make a return of a Note prepared so late as 1881 by Sir David Barbour, upon which the then Finance Minister (Lord Cromer) based his statement in his speech in 1882 about the extreme poverty of the mass of the people. I do not see why the Government of India should refuse. The Note, I am told, is an important document. Government for its own sake should be ready to give it. In 1880, the present Duke of Devonshire, then Secretary of State for India, readily gave me some statistics and information prepared by Mr. F. Danvers, though I did not know of their existence. This enabled me to point out some errors and to explain some points which had been misunderstood. Such information is extremely necessary, not merely for the sake of the exceedingly poor masses of the people, but for the very stability of the British power itself.

The question of the Poverty of India should be fully raised, grappled with and settled. The Government ought to deal boldly and broadly with it. Let there be a return in detail, correctly calculated, made every year of the *total* annual income of *all* British India, per head of population, and of the requirements of a labourer to live in working health, and not as a starved beast of burden. Unless such complete and accurate information is given every year in detail, it is idle and useless to make mere unfounded assertions that India is prospering.

It must also be remembered that Lord Cromer's annual average of not more than Rs. 27 per head is for the whole population, including the rich and all classes, and not what the great mass of the population can or do actually get. Out of the total annual income of British India all that portion must be deducted which belongs to European Planters, Manufacturers, and Mine owners, and not to the people of British India, excepting the poor wages they receive, to grudge to give away their own country's wealth, to the benefit of a foreign people. Another portion is enjoyed in and carried out from the country on a far larger share per head by many who are not the children of the soil—official and non-official. Then the upper and middle classes of the Indians themselves receive much more than their average share. The great mass of the poor people therefore have a much lower average than even the wretched "not more than Rs. 27" per head.

You know that I had calculated the average of the income as being Rs. 20 per head per annum, and when Lord Cromer's statement of Rs. 27 appeared, I requested him to give me his calculations but he refused. However, Rs. 20 or "not more than Rs. 27"—how wretched is the condition of a country of such income, after a hundred years of the most costly administration, and can such a thing last? (*Cries of* "*no, no*".)

It is remarkable that there is no phase of the Indian problem which

clear-headed and fair-minded Anglo-Indians have not already seen and indicated. More than a hundred years ago, in 1787, Sir John Shore wrote these remarkable, farseeing, and prophetic words :—

"Whatever allowance we may make for the increased industry of the subjects of the State, owing to the enhanced demand for the produce of it (supposing the demand to be enhanced), there is reason to conclude that the benefits are more than counter-balanced by evils inseparable from the system of a remote foreign dominion."—*Parl. Ret. 377 of 1812.*

And these words of prophecy are true to the present day. I pass over what has been said by other European Officials at different times during the hundred years. I come to 1886, and here is a curious and complete response after a hundred years by the Secretary of State for India. In a despatch (26th January, 1886) to the Treasury, he makes a significant admission about the consequences of the character of the Government of the foreign rule of Britain. He says :—

"The position of India in relation to taxation and the sources of the public revenues is very peculiar, not merely from the habits of the people and their strong aversion to change which is more specially exhibited to new forms of taxation, but likewise from the character of the Government, which is in the hands of foreigners, who hold all the principal administrative offices and form so large a part of the Army. The imposition of new taxation which would have to be borne wholly as a consequence of the foreign rule imposed on the country and virtually to meet additions to charges arising outside of the country would constitute a political danger, the real magnitude of which, it is to be feared, is not at all appreciated by persons who have no knowledge of or concern in the Government of India, but which those responsible for that Government have long regarded as of the most serious order."

What a strange confirmation, fulfilment and explanation of the very reason of the prophecy of a hundred years ago, and admission *now* that because the character of the present Government is such that "*it is in the hands of the foreigners who hold all the principal administrative offices and form so large a part of the army*," the consequence of it is a "*political danger*," the real magnitude of which is "*of the most serious order.*"

Need I, after this declaration even, despair that some of our Anglo-Indian friends would not take a lesson from the Secretary of State and understand the evil of the system under which India is suffering? Have I ever said anything clearer or stronger than this despatch has done? It gives my whole fear of the future perils to the people of India and political danger to the British Power, in a nutshell. This shows that some of our Anglo-Indian authorities have not been, nor are, so dull and blind as not to have seen before or see now the whole peril of the position, and the unnatural and suicidal system of administration.

Yes, figures are quoted by some of what they call "increase of trade," "balance of trade in favour of India," "increase of industry," "hoarding of treasure in British India," etc., etc.; but our misfortune is that these people, with bias and

prejudices and pre-possessions, and apparently having not very clear ideas of the principles, processes, and details of commercial and banking operations and transactions, and of the perturbations of what Sir John Shore called "the evils of a distant foreign dominion," are not able to understand and read aright these facts and figures of the commercial and economic conditions of British India. These people do not realise or seem to understand that what are called "the trade returns of British India" are misleading, and are *not* the trade returns of *British India.* A good portion of both the imports and exports of both merchandise and treasure belong to the Native States and to countries beyond the borders, and not to British India. A separate return must be made of the imports and exports of the non-British territories, so that a correct account of the true trade of British India may be given by itself—and then there should be some statement of the exports which are not trade exports at all, but only political and private European remittances; and then only will it be seen how wretched this British Indian true trade is, and how fallacious and misleading the present returns are. A return is made every year called "The Material and Moral Progress of India." But that part regarding "Material Progress" to which I am confining my observations is very imperfect and misleading. As I have already said, nothing short of a return every year of the average annual income per head of population of British India, and of the absolute necessaries of life for a healthy labourer, in detailed calculation can give any correct idea of the progress or otherwise of the material condition of the people of British India. I ask for "detailed calculation" in the returns, because some of the officials seem to have rather vague notions of the Arithmetic of Averages, and though the foundation figures may be correct, they bring out results far from truth. I have pointed out this with instances in my papers. I have communicated with the Secretary of State for India, and he has communicated with the Governments in India. But I do not know how far this correction has been attended to by those who calculate averages.

What is grievous is that the present unnatural system, as predicted by Sir John Shore, is destructive to us, with a partial benefit to the United Kingdom with our curse upon it. But were a natural system to prevail, the commercial and industrial benefits aided by perfect free trade that exists between India and the United Kingdom, will be to both countries of an extent of which we can at present form no conception.

But here is an inexhaustible market of 221,000,000 of their own civilized fellow-citizens with some 66,000,000 more of the people of the Native States, and what a great trade would arise with such an enormous market, and the United Kingdom would not for a long time hear anything about her "unemployed." It is only some people of the United Kingdom of the higher classes that at present draw all the benefit from India. The great mass of the people do not derive that benefit from the connection with India which they ought to get with benefit to both countries. On the other hand, it is with the Native States that there is some comparatively decent trade. With British India, as compared with its

population, the trade of the United Kingdom is wretched indeed after a century of a very costly administration paid for by the poverty-stricken ryots.

Truly has Macaulay said emphatically : "To trade with civilised man is infinitely more profitable than to govern savages ; that would indeed be a doting wisdom, which, in order that India might remain a dependency, would make it a useless and costly dependency, which would keep a hundred millions (now really 221,000,000) of men from being our customers in order that they might continue to be our slaves." Should this doting wisdom continue ?

It is impossible for me to explain in this address all the misapprehensions. I have already explained my views as fully as possible in my papers. These views were at first ridiculed and pooh-poohed till the highest financial authorities, the latest Finance Ministers themselves, admitted the extreme poverty of India. Lord Cromer summed up the situation in these remarkable words in 1882: "It has been calculated that the average income per head of population in India is not more than Rs. 27 a year." "In England the average income per year per head of population was £33 ; in France it was £23 ; in Turkey which was the poorest country in Europe, it was £ 4 a head." Comment is unnecessary. Let us and the Government not live in a fool's paradise,or time may bring disasters to both when it is too late to stop them. This poverty is the greatest danger both to us and the rulers. In what shapes and varieties of forms the disease of poverty may attack the body-politic, and bring out and aggravate other evils, it is difficult to tell or foresee, but that there is danger of "most serious order," as the Secretary of State declares, nobody can deny.

Were the people of British India allowed to enjoy the fruits of their own labour and resources, and were fair relations established between the British and Indian peoples, with India contented and prosperous, Britain may defy half a dozen Russias. *(Loud cheers.)* Indians will then fight to the last man and to the last rupee for their share, as patriots and not as mercenaries. The rulers will have only to stamp their foot, and millions will spring up to defend the British power and their own hearths and homes. *(Renewed Cheering.)*

We, the Congress, are only desirous of supporting Government, and having this important matter of poverty grappled with and settled, we are anxious to prevent "the Political danger" of the "most serious order," declared to exist by the Secretary of State himself. We desire that the British connection should endure for a long time to come for the sake of our material and political elevation among the civilised nations of the world. It is no pleasure or profit to us to complain unnecessarily or wantonly about this poverty.

Were we enemies of British rule, our best course would be, not to cry out, but remain silent, and let the mischief take its course till it ends in disaster as it must. But we do not want that disaster, and we therefore cry out, both for our own sake, and for the sake of the rulers. *This evil of poverty must be boldly faced and remedied.*

This is the question to which we shall have to devote our best energies. We

have, no doubt, to contend against many difficulties, but they must be surmounted for everybody's sake.

The next subject to which I desire to draw your attention is this. We have a large costly European Army and European Civil Services. It is not to be supposed that in these remarks I accept the necessity for them. I take at present the situation as it is. I now submit to the calm consideration of the British people and Government these questions. Is all this European service entirely for the sole benefit of India? Has the United Kingdom no interest or benefit in it? Does not the greatness of, and the greatest benefit to, the United Kingdom arise from its connection with India? Should not the cost of such greatness and great benefits be shared by the United Kingdom in proportion to its means and benefit? Are not these European services especially imposed upon us on the clearly admitted and declared ground of maintaining the British power? Let us see what our rulers themselves say.

Lord Beaconsfield said:—

"We had to decide what was the best step to counteract the efforts Russia was then making, for though war had not been declared, her movements had commenced in Central Asia, and the struggle has commenced which was to decide for ever which power should possess the great gates of India, and that the real question at issue was whether England should possess the gates of her own great Empire in India, and whether the time had not arrived when we could no longer delay that the problem should be solved and in a manner as it has been solved by Her Majesty's Government."—Hansard, Vol. 250, p. 1094, 25th February, 1880.

Again he says:—

"We resolved that the time has come when this country should acquire the complete command and possession of the gates of the Indian Empire. Let me at least believe that the Peers of England are still determined to uphold not only the Empire but the honour of this country."

Can any words be more emphatic to show the vast and most vital stakes, honour and interests of the United Kingdom?

Lord Kimberley, the Secretary of State for India, tells us:—

"We are resolutely determined to maintain our supremacy over our Indian Empire . . . . that among other things," he says, "that supremacy rests upon the maintenance of our European Civil Service," that "we rest also upon the magnificent European Force which we maintain in that country."—*Times*, 13th June, 1893. Mansion House Dinner to Lord Roberts.

This again is another emphatic declaration of the vast stakes and interest of the United Kingdom for which the European Services are maintained entirely at our expense.

I shall give one more authority only:—

See what a man like Lord Roberts, the symbol of physical force admits. He says to the London Chamber of Commerce: "I rejoice to learn that you recognise how indissolubly the prosperity of the United Kingdom is bound up with the

retention of that vast Eastern Empire," (*Times*, 25 May, 1893. Dinner by the London Chamber of Commerce.) and again he says at Glasgow: "That the retention of our Eastern Empire is essential to the greatness and prosperity of the United Kingdom." (*Times*, 29th July 1893). Now, I ask again, that with all such deep, vast and great interests, and the greatness and prosperity of the United Kingdom, essentially depending on the Eastern Empire, and indissolubly bound up with it is it reasonable, is it just and fair, is it British that *all* the cost of such greatness, glory, and prosperity of the United Kingdom should be entirely, to the last farthing, thrown upon the wretched Indians, as if the only relations existing between the United Kingdom and India were not of mutual benefit, but of mere masters and slaves as Macaulay pointed out to be deprecated." (*Applause and cries of "no, no."*)

As for the navy, the *Times* regards and it is generally admitted that the very existence of Britain itself depends upon the command of the sea. The *Times* says: "They will never forgive the Minister or the Ministry that leaves them weaker at sea than any possible combination of France and another power."

By a telegram I read at Aden I found Mr. Gladstone "re-affirmed the necessity of British supremacy."

For any war vessels that may be stationed in India for the protection of the interests of both, the expenditure may be fairly shared.

In the Bill for the better Government of Ireland there are provisions by which Ireland is required to pay a certain share of the Imperial expenditure according to its means, and when necessary to pay a similar share of any extraordinary expenditure, Ireland having all its resources at its own command. Now see how vastly different is our position. Not only will Ireland have all her internal services, Irish or under Irish rules causing no foreign drain from her, but she will also, as she has always enjoyed, continue to enjoy her share in all the gain and glory of the British Empire. Irishmen can be Viceroys, Governors, and have any of the appointments in the military or civil services of the Empire, with the additional advantage of a large number of members in Parliament. The Indians, on the other hand, have not only no such share at all in the gains and glory of the British Empire, but are excluded even from the services of their own country, with the consequences of an exhausting foreign drain, of the deplorable evils foretold by Sir John Shore and subjected to the imposition of every farthing of the expenditure. Nor has India any votes in Parliament. And we have now the additional misfortune that the British Cabinet, since the transfer to the Crown, is no longer the independent tribunal to judge between us and the Indian authorities, and this adds heavily to our difficulties for obtaining justice and redress, except so far as the sense of justice of the non-official members of the Parliament helps us.

There is a strange general misapprehension among the people of the United Kingdom. They do not seem to know that they have not spent a single shilling either in the formation of the British Indian Empire or in its maintenance, and

that, as far as I know, every farthing is taken from the Indians, with the only exception in my knowledge that Mr. Gladstone with his sense of justice allowed £5,000,000 towards the last Afghan War, which, without having any voice in it, cost India £ 21,000,000. (*Loud cries of "Shame."*) I cannot blame the people of the United Kingdom generally for this mistake, when even well-informed papers give utterances to this most unfortunate fallacy. As, for instance, a paper like the *Statist*, in the extract which my friend Mr. Dinshaw E. Wacha gave you last year, says: "Whatever may happen, we must defend India to our last shilling and our last man," while the fact is that they have not spent even their first shilling or any shilling at all, (*Laughter.*) but on the contrary derived benefits in various ways from India of millions on millions every year. (*"Shame".*) Nor have the fighters in creating and maintaining the British Indian Empire been only the British soldier to "the last man." Indian soldiers have done the main work, and if India can be made prosperous and contented as it can be by true statesmanship, the Indian soldier will be ready to fight to "the last man" to defend British power. (*Loud cheers.*)

Britain in fact cannot send to India "to its last man." The very idea is absurd; on the contrary she can draw from India for her European purpose an inexhaustible strength.

Again, the *Statist* says:—"We are at this moment spending large sums of money in preparing against a Russian attack." Not a farthing of the British money? Every farthing of these "large sums," and which are crushing us, is "imposed" upon the people of British India. Such misleading statements are often made in the English press to our great injury. (*"Shame."*)

I repeat, then, that we must submit to the just consideration of the British people and Parliament whether it is just and right that they should not pay a fair share, according to their stakes and means, towards all such expenditure as is incurred for the benefit of both India and the United Kingdom, such expenditure, and the respective share of each, being settled on a peace footing, any extraordinary expenditure against any foreign invasion being also further fairly shared.

Before closing this subject, I may just remark that while leaving necessarily the highest offices of power and control, such as Viceroys and Governors to Europeans, I regard the enormous European Services as a great political and imperial weakness, in critical political times to the British power, as well as the cause, as the present Duke of Devonshire pointed out, of the insufficiency of an efficient administration of the country: and also the main cause of the evils foretold by Sir John Shore, and admitted by the Secretary of State for India, after a hundred years, as a political danger of "a most serious order"; and of the poverty of India.

I would not say much upon the next subject, as you have had only lately the highest testimonies of two Viceroys and three Secretaries of State for India—of Lord Northbrook and Lord Ripon, and of the Duke of Argyll, Lord Cross, and Lord Kimberley. You remember the debate raised by Lord Northbrook in the House of Lords a few months ago that the Home Military Charges were unfair

and unjust, and all the authorities I have named endorsed the complaint. But even the heads of the Indian authorities are so much in terror of the Treasury that Lord Kimberley said :—"The India Office has no particular desire that the question should be re-opened and discussed anew for bitter experience has taught the department that the re-opening of a question of this kind generally results in the imposition of additional charges." Is this one other disadvantage of the transfer to the Crown ? Lord Kimberley hit the nail on the head why India was so unfairly treated (and the same may be applied to such other treatment of India by the Indian authorities themselves) when he said :—" The reasons why proposals that must throw fresh burdens on the Government of India are so frequently made in the House of Commons is that those who make them know that their own pockets will not suffer in the desire to make things agreeable and comfortable. (*Laughter.*) The taxpayers of the country exercise no check upon such proposals, and the consequence is that charges are sometimes imposed upon the Government of India which that Government thinks unjust and unnecessary." It must be borne in mind that charges "imposed on the Government of India" means the suffering party is the poor taxpayer of India.

The Duke of Argyll characterises these charges as "unjust and illegal tribute to England." But mark the words of Lord Cross :—"I am certain that in the course of a few years the Indian people will force us to do them justice." This is just the feature "to be forced to do justice" which I always deplore. We desire that all necessary reforms and acts of justice should be spontaneous on the part of Britain, in good grace and in good time as gifts claiming our gratitude, and not to wait till "*forced*," with loss of grace from the giver and the loss of gratitude from the receiver. (*Hear, hear.*)

I offer my thanks to Lord Northbrook and other Lords for that debate, though yet barren of any result. But we may fairly hope that such debate must sooner or later produce good results. It is like a good seed sown and will fructify.

Here are some smaller items : The cost of the India Office Building of about half a million, of the Royal Engineering College of £134,000, and of other buildings is all cast on India. The cost of the Colonial Office Building, £100,000, is paid from the British Exchequer. The India Office Establishment, etc., about £230,000 a year, is all imposed on India, while the £41,000 of the Colonial Office and £168,000 for Colonial Services are paid from the British Exchequer. The Public Debt of India (excluding Railway and Productive Works) is incurred in creating and preserving the British power, but all our cries to give us at least the benefit of a British guarantee have been in vain, with the curious suicidal effort of showing to the world that the British Government itself has no confidence in the stability of its own power in India (*Hear, hear.*)

In 1870 Mr. Gladstone declared India to be " too much burdened," when the Annual Expenditure was £39,000,000; what expression can be used now when, with an extremely poor income, the burden now is nearly 75 per cent. heavier, or Rx 68,000,000 this year.

Passing on to the other subjects, I hope the separation of Executive and Judicial functions will receive attention as its necessity has been recognised. We have to persevere for this as well as for other parts of our programme, bearing in mind one great difficulty we have to contend with. Unfortunately the Indian authorities when they determine to do or not to do a thing under the notion of preserving prestige and strength, as if any false prestige can be a strength, disregard even Resolutions or Acts of Parliament itself, and resort to every device to carry their own point or view. (*Loud cries of "Shame."*) We cannot expect Parliament to watch Indian affairs from day to day, and therein lies the impunity and immunity of the Indian Administration.

I shall refer to only two instances: First, the case of the misleadingly called "The Statutory Service," and what in reality was created out of, and as a part and parcel of, the Covenanted Civil Service. I can speak with some authority, for I was the very proposer of the Memorial of the East India Association to Sir Stafford Northcote which resulted in the Clause of the Act of 1870. But the Indian authorities would not have it. They moved heaven and earth to thwart it; it is a long and a sad story for the good name of Britain, and they never rested till they made the Statute a dead letter, though it still stands on the Statute Book of the Imperial Parliament. ("*Shame.*") However, I hear with pleasure, and I hope it is true, that a disposition has arisen, for which I understand Lord Kimberley is to be thanked, to redress this glaring and unfortunate wrong—unfortunate for British prestige, for British honour and British good faith, and I do hope that the Government would do this redress ungrudgingly, with good grace, completeness and generosity. This instance illustrates another unfortunate phase of the Administration.

The Forest Department is recruited by examinations in England and by selection in India. Such selection is not based upon a Resolution or Act of Parliament, but upon the will of the authorities and consisting of Europeans. The Government of India in Resolution No. 18 F, of 29th July, 1891, have described them as untrained and uncovenanted officers, who have been unconditionally appointed in past years, and yet they are ordered in the regular Indian Forest Service; while those Native Civilians, created and backed by an Act of Parliament, as distinctly belonging to the Covenanted Civil Service, are excluded from that Civil Service to which the Act distinctly appointed them. Can such difference of treatment of Europeans and Indians preserve British prestige for honour and justice, and would it increase or diminish the existing attachment of the Indians to British rule?

The second instance was the practical disregard of the Resolution of the House of Commons about the State regulation of vice. But in this case there were vigilant watchers like Mrs. Butler, Mr. Stansfeld, M. P., Mr. Stuart, M. P., and others, and they did not allow the Resolution to become a dead letter. In this case also I am glad to find that the Indian authorities now mean to give loyal effect to the Resolution, and well may they do so, for the sake of the British good name,

fame, and prestige, for morality of every kind upon which mainly British strength and influence rest.

On the Currency Question I need not dwell much. My views are unknown to you. Now that the Sherman Law is repealed by the United States, we may hope to see a settled condition in time. No amount of currency, jugglery or devices in this country could have any influence (except that of creating troubles in the country itself, as has happened) on the loss in the remittances to England for Home charges which must be paid in gold, and will fluctuate with the rise or fall of gold in the United Kingdom. As if this crushing loss was not enough for the wretched taxpayers, further burdens were laid to make things agreeable and comfortable with other people's money, as Lord Kimberley would say, of high exchange to the European officials, and the further most unwarranted payment of £ 138,000 to the banks, with whose transactions in profits or loss the taxpayer has no connection whatever. ("*Shame, shame,*") Some strange precedents are made in this matter to silence opposition and to support banks at the expense of the taxpayers, which will lead to serious troubles in the future. Should not the millowners and other concerns also claim compensation for the dislocation of their industry or transactions by the currency action of the Government, as Government itself admits to have caused such dislocation? Would the British Exchequer have paid any such money to the British banks? Such a thing would never have been thought of. The utmost that is done in any crisis is allowing the Bank of England to issue more notes under strong restrictions. Had the banks made profits instead of loss, would they have handed them to the taxpayer ? Then it would have been called the reward of shrewdness, foresight, enterprise, etc., etc.

The whole currency troubles from which India is suffering, and which are so peculiar to India and so deplorable to the Indian taxpayer, and from which no other silver-using country suffers, is one of the best illustrations and object lessons, and proof of the soundness of Sir John Shore's prophecy about the evil consequences of the present unatural system of a remote foreign dominion, or as the Secretary of State called the danger of "a most serious order."

The currency muddle will necessitate new taxation. The usual easy and unchecked resource of putting off the evil day by borrowing is already resorted to, and in the spirit of keeping things agreeable and comfortable to those who have votes in Parliament, there is danger of increase in the salt tax. I do hope that Government will have some moral courage and some mercy upon the wretched taxpayer, and reduce even the salt tax by re-imposing the cotton duties. Not that by this means India will be saved a pie from the addition of burdens, but that a little better able shoulders will have to bear them, or, as Lord Salisbury once coolly put it, that as India must be bled, the lancet should be directed to the parts where there was at least sufficient blood, not to those which are already feeble from the want of it.

Another subject of our future work to which I need only touch now is the relations of the Government with the Native States. There is much unnecessary

irritation and dissatisfaction where there ought to be the pleasantest harmony with much greater devoted loyalty than what even now really exists. And it is also a great mistake for a foreign power not to draw the military capacity and spirit of the country to their own side by giving it a fair career and interest in their own service. Make the military races feel it to their advantage and interest to be loyal to the British rule instead of keeping them alienated from the Government.

I need not say more upon our future work, as various Resolutions of importance will be placed before you for your consideration, and I am sure you will deliberate with that moderation and fairness for which you have already distinguished yourselves and acquired just credit, and for which I offer you my hearty congratulations. You recognise, I have no doubt, that at every turn you have yet serious questions to grapple with and much work to do.

Any one who has watched my public career must have seen that my main underlying principle and the desire of my heart is to promote, as far as I can, good fellow-feeling among all my countrymen. (*Loud applause.*) And I have no doubt that all the educated and thinking men and all true friends of our own country will continue to do all that lies in their power to bring about stronger and stronger friendly ties of common nationality, fellow-feeling, and due deference to each other's views and feelings amongst the whole people of our country.

Government must be firm and just in case of any unfortunate differences ; as far as Government are concerned, their duty is clearly to put down with a strong hand any lawlessness or disturbance of the peace, no matter who the parties concerned may be. They can only stand, as they ought, on the only sure and right foundation of even-handed justice to all, and cannot allow any one to take the law into his own hands ; the only wise policy is to adhere to their declared policy of strict neutrality and equal protection and justice to all creeds. (*Hear, hear.*)

I was much pleased to read in the papers that cordial conferences had been held between Muhammadans and Hindus in various places to device means to prevent any deplorable occurrences happening in the future.

Looking back to the past as my own personal experience of my life, and as far back as I know of earlier days, at least on my side of India, I feel a congratulation that all association and societies of members of all creeds have worked together in harmony and union, without any consideration of class or creed in all matters concerning our common national public and political interests. No doubt, latterly, even in such common matters, differences of views have arisen and will arise, but such differences of views, when genuine, are healthy, just as is the case in the United Kingdom itself with its two political parties. (*Hear, hear.*)

What makes me still more gratified and look forward hopefully in the future is that our Congress has not only worked so far in the union and concord of all classes and creeds, but has taken care to provide that such harmony should continue in the future. As early as in the Congress at Allahabad of 1888 you passed this Resolution (XIII) :—

"That no subject shall be passed for discussion by the Subject Committee, or allowed to be discussed at any Congress by the President thereof, to the introduction of which the Hindu or Muhammadan delegates as a body object unanimously or nearly unanimously; and that if, after the discussion of any subject which has been admitted for discussion, it shall appear that all the Hindu or all the Muhammadan delegates as a body are unanimously or nearly unanimously opposed to the Resolution which it is proposed to pass thereon, such Resolution shall be dropped; provided that this rule shall refer only to subjects in regard to which the Congress has not already definitely pronounced an opinion."

As I have already said, the highest wish of my heart is that all the people of India should regard and treat each other as fellow-countrymen, with fellow-feeling for the good of all. (*Applause.*)

We may, I am convinced, rest fully assured that whatever political or national benefit we may acquire will in one or other way benefit all classes, (*Hear, hear.*) the benefit of each taking various forms. The interests of us all are the same. We are all in the same boat. We must sink or swim together. Government cannot but treat us all alike. It is unreasonable for us to expect from them, and unjust and unwise for them to show, any undue favour to any particular class or community. The only solid foundation for them is justice and impartiality, and the only just demand from us also can only be justice and impartiality. (*Loud applause.*)

If the country is prosperous, then if one gets scope in one walk of life, another will have in another walk of life. As our Indian saying goes: "If there is water in the well it will come to the cistern." If we have the well of prosperity we shall be able to draw each our share from it. But if the well is dry we must all go without any at all.

A word for the basis upon which the strength of British power stands. Britain hold India, or any one country can hold another, by moral force only. You can build up an empire by arms or ephemeral brute physical force, but you can preserve it by the eternal moral forces only. Brute force will, some time or other, break down; righteousness alone is everlasting. (*Cheers*). Well and truly has Lord Ripon said "that the British power and influence rests upon the conviction of our good faith more than upon the valour of our soldiers or the reputation of our arms." (*Applause.*) Mr. Gladstone says: "It is the predominance of that moral force for which I heartily pray in the deliberations of this House and the conduct of our whole public policy, for I am convinced that upon that predominance depends that which should be the first object of all our desires, as it is of all our daily official prayers, namely, that union of heart and sentiment which constitutes the truest basis of strength at home, and therefore both of strength and good fame throughout the civilised world."—Debates, 9th August, 1892. p. 1892. (*Applause.*)

And here is a remarkable instance cited by Mr. Gladstone of a people of a different race becoming attached even to the much despised Turkish rule. How much more will the people of India, if contented and prosperous, become attached

to the rule of such a people as the British? Referring to Lebanon, Mr. Gladstone said: "Owing to the wise efforts of Lord Dufferin and others about thirty years ago local management was established since which the province has become contented and attached to the Turkish empire."

Lord Roberts, the apostle of British strong arm to maintain British power, and though much imbued with many of the prejudices against the progress of the Indians, as a true soldier admits without hesitation what he considers as the only solid foundation upon which British strength must for ever rest. He says: "But however efficient and well equipped the army of India may be, were it indeed absolute perfection and were its numbers considerably more than they are at present, our greatest strength must ever rest on the firm base of a united and contented India."

Truer and more statesmanlike words could not be uttered. Permit me to give one more extract. Mr. Gladstone, referring to Irish Home Rule, said: "There can be no nobler spectacle than that which we think is now drawing upon us, the spectacle of a nation deliberately set on the removal of injustice, deliberately determined to break, not through terror and not in haste, but under the sole influence of duty and honour, determined to break with whatever remains still existing of an evil tradition, and determined in that way at once to pay a debt of justice and to consult by a bold, wise, and good act its own interests and its own honour."

Am I at all unreasonable in hoping that such noble statesmanship, honour, and good faith of the British people will, in fulness of time, also extend to India similar justice? I shall hope as long as I live.

Let us always remember that we are all children of our mother country. Indeed, I have never worked in any other spirit than that I am an Indian, (*cheers.*) and owe duty to my country and all my countrymen. Whether I am a Hindu, a Muhammadan, a Parsi, a Christian, or of any other creed, I am above all an Ind[ian.] Our country is India; our nationality is Indian. (*Loud cheers.*)

The question for us, especially a body like this, who have received the blessings of education, is: How are we to perform our duty to our country? Certainly no one requires to be taught that no great cause or object can ever be accomplished without great sacrifices—personal and pecuniary. We can never succeed with the British people by mere declamations. We must show that we believe in the justice of our cause by our earnestness and self-sacrifice. (*Hear, hear.*)

I desire now to impress upon my countrymen with all the earnestness I am capable of to prepare themselves for sacrifices. We observe every day what sacrifices the British people make for attaining any object, great or small, and how persistently they stick to it; and among the lessons which we are learning from them let us learn this particular one, with the double advantage and effect of showing that Indians have public spirit and love of their country, and also proving that they are earnest in what they are asking. (*Applause.*)

Our work for the amelioration of our country and for obtaining all the rights and benefits of British citizenship will go on increasing, and it is absolutely necessary that our organisation, both here and in the United Kingdom, should be much improved and made complete. Without good organisation no important work can be successfully done; and that means much pecuniary and personal sacrifice. We must remember the Congress meets once a year. The General Secretaries and the Standing Committees have to carry out the details and inform the circles of the work and resolutions of the Congress.

But the most important and national work formulated by the Congress has to be done with watchfulness, day after day, in London by your British Committee. (*Cheers.*) And, further, by your Resolution XII. of the seventh Session, you "urged them (the Committee) to widen henceforth the sphere of their usefulness by interesting themselves not only in those questions dealt with by the Congress, but in all Indian matters submitted to them and properly vouched for in which any principle accepted by the Congress is involved." (*Renewed cheering.*)

Fancy what this means. Why, it is another India Office! You have put all India's every-day work upon the shoulders of the Committee. It becomes exceedingly necessary for efficient and good work to have some paid person or persons to devote time to study the merits of all the representations which pour in with every mail, or by telegrams, before any action can be taken on them. It is in the United Kingdom that all our great fights are to be fought, all our national and imperial questions are to be settled, and it is to our British Committee in London that we have to look for the performance of all this responsible and arduous work, with the unfortunate feature that we have to contend against many adverse influences, prepossessions and misunderstandings. We have to make the British people unlearn a good deal.

On the other hand, we have this hopeful feature also that we have not only many British friends, but also Anglo-Indians, who, in the true spirit of justice and of the gratitude to the country to which they owe their past career and future provision, appreciate the duty they owe to India, and are desirous to help us, and to preserve the British Empire by the only certain means of justice, the honour and righteousness of the British people, and by the contentment and prosperity of India.

You know well how much we owe to the present English members of our Committee, Sir William Wedderburn. (*Three cheers for Sir William Wedderburn.*) Mr. Hume, Mr. Reynolds, Mr. Adam. Mr. Schwann, M.P., and Mr. McLaren, M. P. If we want all such help at the fountain head of power without which we cannot do much good, we must take care to supply them always, promptly and accurately, all necessary sinews of war. (*Hear, hear and applause.*)

Then there is the journal "INDIA," without which our work will not be half as efficient as with it. It is an absolute necessity as an instrument and part of the organization. Every possible effort must be made to give it the widest circulation possible both here and in the United Kingdom. I wish it could be made weekly instead of monthly.

With proper effort ten thousand copies should be easily disposed of here as a beginning, and we *must* do this.

This is the first opportunity I have of meeting you after the Congress of 1886, over which I had the honour to preside at Calcutta. Let me now thank you personally for your constant remembrance of me, for your unceasing encouragement, and for your two most kind and gratifying resolutions passed at the last two sessions as representatives of every class and creed, and almost wholly consisting of Hindu and Muhammadan delegates, and each delegate being elected by and representative of the whole mixed community of the place he represents, on the basis of common interest and nationality. I must beg your indulgence to record those Resolutions in this address. The first Resolution (XIV) passed by the Seventh Congress in 1891, while I was a candidate, is this :—

" Resolved, that this Congress hereby puts formally on record its high esteem and deep appreciation of the great services which Mr. Dadabhai Naoroji has rendered, during more than a quarter of a century, to the cause of India, and it expresses its unshaken confidence in him, and its earnest hope that he may prove successful at the coming election, in his candidature for Central Finsbury ; and at the same time tenders, on behalf of the vast population it represents, India's most cordial acknowledgments to all in England, whether in Central Finsbury or elsewhere, who have aided or may aid him to win a seat in the House of Commons."

I need not say how right earnestly Central Finsbury listened to your appeal and fulfilled your hope, for which we owe them our most unstinted thanks, and to all those who helped in or out of Central Finsbury. (*Loud applause.*)

I may here once more express my hearty thanks to many ladies and gentlemen who worked hard for my election. After I was elected, you passed the second Resolution (XVI.) in the last Session. I may point here to the significant incident that in that Congress there was, I think, only one Parsi delegate and he even not the delegate of Parsis, but of all classes of the people. This Resolution was :—

" Resolved that this Congress most respectfully and cordially tenders, on behalf of the vast population it represents, India's most heartfelt thanks to the Electors of Central Finsbury for electing Mr. Dadabhai Naoroji their Member in the House of Commons , and it again puts on record its high esteem and deep appreciation of the services which that gentleman has rendered to this country, reiterates its unshaken confidence in him, and looks upon him as India's representative in the House of Commons."

Let me also now take this opportunity, on Indian soil, to tender my most heartfelt thanks for the telegrams, letters and addresses of congratulation which I received from all parts and classes of India—literally I may say from the prince to the peasant, from members of all creeds, from Hindus, Muhammadans, Christians, Parsis, from Ceylon, from the High Priest of Budhists, and Budhists, and other residents from the Cape, British Guiana, Australia, and in short from every part of

the British Empire where there were Indian residents. Ladies and Gentlemen, put aside my personality and let me join in your rejoicings as an Indian in the great event in Indian annals of an Indian finding his way in the Imperial Parliament. (*Loud and Prolonged Cheering.*)

And lastly, beginning from the distant Western Gate of India, where the Indian residents of Aden, of all creeds, gave me a most hearty reception; then the great portal of India, the dear old city of my birth, gave me a most magnificent welcome with its never-ceasing kindness towards me, Poona doing her best to vie with Bombay, and through the Punjab so splendidly; and this series of welcomes now ending in your extraordinary one which I am utterly unable to describe. Is there any reward more grand and more gratifying than the esteem, the joy with my joy, the sorrow with my sorrow, and above all the "unshaken confidence" of my fellow-countrymen and country-women of our grand, old, beloved country?

I may refer to an incident which, as it is satisfactory, is also very significant of the real desire of the British people to do justice to India. The congratulations on my election from all parts of the United Kingdom also were as hearty and warm as we could desire, and expressing satisfaction that an Indian would be able to voice the wants and aspirations of India in the House of Commons.

I can assure the Congress that, as I hope and wish, if you will pay an early visit to the United Kingdom and hold a session there, you will obtain a kind and warm reception from its peoples. And you will, by such direct and personal appeal to the British Nation, accomplish a vast amount of good. (*Hear, hear.*)

Our fate and our future are in our own hands. If we are true to ourselves and to our country and make all the necessary sacrifices for our elevation and amelioration, I for one have not the shadow of a doubt that in dealing with such justice-loving, fair-minded people as the British, we may rest fully assured that we shall not work in vain. It is this conviction which has supported me against all difficulties. I have never faltered in my faith in the British character and have always believed that the time will come when the sentiments of the British Nation and our Gracious Sovereign proclaimed to us in our Great Charter of the Proclamation of 1858 will be realised, (*applause*) *viz.*, "In their prosperity will be our strength, in their contentment our best reward." And let us join in the prayer that followed this hopeful declaration of our Sovereign: "May the God of all power grant to us and to those in authority under us strength to carry out these our wishes for the good of our people."

My last prayer and exhortation to the Congress and to all my countrymen is —Go on united and earnest, in concord and harmony, with moderation, with loyalty to the British rule and patriotism towards our country, and success is sure to attend our efforts for our just demands, and the day, I hope, is not distant when the world will see the noblest spectacle of a great nation like the British holding out the hand of true fellow-citizenship and of justice to the vast mass of humanity of this great and ancient land of India with benefits and blessings to the human race. (Loud and prolonged cheering.)

Tenth Congress—Madras—1894.

Mr. ALFRED WEBB M. P.

Friends and Fellow-Subjects,—You call me to the presidency of the tenth meeting of the Indian National Congress. Thanking you for the honor, I proceed to discharge the duties of the post under a sense of its privileges and responsibilities.

The objects of these Congresses cannot be better stated than in the words of your first President:—" The promotion of personal intimacy and friendship amongst all the more earnest workers in [your] country's cause in all parts of the Empire ; the eradication by direct friendly intercourse of all possible race, creed, or national prejudices amongst all lovers of [your] country ; and the fuller development and consolidation of those sentiments of national unity that had their origin in [your] Lord Ripon's ever-memorable reign : the authoritative record, after this has been carefully elicited by the fullest discussion, of the matured opinions of the educated classes in India on some of the more important and pressing of the social questions of the day : the determination of the lines upon, and the methods by which, during the next twelve months, it is desirable for native politicians to labour in the public interests."

The ends you have in view are similar to those of politicians in other quarters of the globe. The difficulties before you are however greater. Elsewhere politicians have to deal principally with homogeneous populations, to whom, at least in theory, equal political right may at once be accorded ; you have largely to work for those who yet have to pass through a long process of assimilation and elevation. All the greater necessity that in assemblages such as this you should set yourselves to the task. All the greater necessity that a deaf ear should be turned to doctrines of despair. The question is not regarding the difficulties, but as to whether or not the difficulties are to be faced ; and if to be faced, the sooner the better. And it is alone by and through organizations such as yours that they can be faced.

It is at the same time necessary to bear in mind that you stand at the most critical period of a people's history. Your populations, heretofore supine, are awakening to consciousness and new hopes, whilst they may not as yet have fully acquired habits of self-restraint and sentiments of responsibility. Mistakes are certain to be made, and are sure to be attributed by opponents, not to their true source—former conditions, but to the awakening—the ennobling process. We must be prepared to meet misrepresentations and calumny. We must take heed that in our leading we give no just cause for accusation.

You have met at Bombay twice, at Calcutta twice, at Allahabad twice, at Nagpur, at Lahore ; you now meet at Madras for the second time. But seventy-two representatives attended your first assembly. The numbers gradually increased to over 1,000 at Bombay, since which meeting they have, on your own motion, for

concentration of effectiveness, been restricted to from about 700 to 1,000. Your proceedings have been conducted with dignity, fairness, courtesy, and tact.

Your Presidents hitherto have been distinguished men, mainly, as was right, from amongst your own people, and representing, as they should, some of the principal races and religions of India. Most eminent amongst these Presidents was Dadabhai Naoroji, not only because of his great abilities and his life-long services to his country; but because of the position he occupies as your only native representative in the Imperial Parliament. The electors of Finsbury have done themselves honour in returning him. As to your other native Presidents, the ability of their addresses and the manner in which they conducted your proceedings showed their fitness for the trusts confided to them. The lamented George Yule of Calcutta, almost one of yourselves, presided at your Fourth Congress. Sir William Wedderburn conducted the fifth. I have styled Mr. Naoroji your only *native* representative in the Imperial Parliament. In Sir William Wedderburn you have another representative equally zealous and devoted—one of the faithful few whose clear conceptions of equality and justice have been unobscured by long official service. There is another name which, although not on the list of your Presidents, cannot be omitted in recalling, however slightly, your past proceedings—that of Charles Bradlaugh, "the friend and champion of India." He attended and addressed your fifth Congress. The report of the sixth is formally dedicated to his memory. You never lost a better or an abler friend. Few men were ever so sincerely mourned by a larger proportion of the human race.

Having already placed in the chair two Scotchmen, you have now chosen an Irishman. Doubtless, after a becoming interval with native Presidents, you will call an Englishman. My nationality is the principal ground for my having been selected. I have none of the brilliant qualifications of my predecessors. On your kind invitation I take the position that was intended for a great fellow-countryman of my own. However I do not question the fitness of your choice, for I am representative in several respects. I was nurtured in the conflict against American slavery. In the words of William Lloyd Garrison, the founder of that movement, "My country is the world; my countrymen are all mankind." To aid in the elevation of my native land has been the endeavour of my riper years. In the words of Daniel O'Connell, "My sympathies are not confined to my own green island. I am a friend to civil and religious liberty all over the world." I hate tyranny and oppression wherever practised, more especially if practised by my own Government, for then I am in a measure responsible. I have felt the bitterness of subjection in my own country. I am a member of the Irish Parliamentary Party. I am one of the Indian Parliamentary Committee. I am a Dissenter, proud of the struggles of my Quaker forefathers for freedom of thought and action: a Protestant returned by a Catholic constituency—a Protestant living in a Catholic country, testifying against craven fears of a return to obsolete religious bitterness and intolerance—fears in your country and in mine worked upon to impede the progress of liberty.

To be placed in this chair is the highest honour to which I can ever aspire.

That I have not resided in India is no disqualification. Free peoples are within their own borders the best judges of their own affairs. But where are concerned the interests of a large population governed by a dominant class, the members of that class, whose apparent interests lie in a continuance of that domination, cannot as a rule fairly judge. There are rare exceptions, such as Sir William Wedderburn, but, generally speaking, their vision is obscured by prejudices. West Indian slavery would never have been abolished by West Indian planters, nor American slavery by Southern Whites. Catholics would never have been emancipated in Ireland, the Church would not have been disestablished, or the franchise extended, by that class there under present institutions.

Nothing in what I have said or intend to say must however be taken as implying want of appreciation of the character and services of numbers of my fellow-citizens, whose lives have been and are given to the administration and government of India. They were doubtless at first attracted to the service solely as a career in life. But residence here, sympathy with your people, and a sense of duty rapidly impel to higher motives. They become sincerely anxious for your welfare and devoted to what they believe your highest good. Never has more conscience been brought to the Government of a conquered country. We here are not set against them, unless, indeed, they are determined to set themselves against us. The services of men of their training, temper, and turn of mind may, perhaps for generations to come, be necessary. They are to be honoured and respected in their sphere. But they must not impede or prevent the gradual application of principles other than those laid down by statesmen of the first rank fully half a century ago to the government of this country. I might perhaps have been more affected than I have been by the attitude and language of many of them regarding your country and your people, were it not that it is such as I have been accustomed to hear from the same class in Ireland towards my country and my people. If the anticipations of these regarding your capacities and your future are as fully belied as have been the anticipations of those regarding our capacities and our future, you may rest satisfied. Closely allied, as they have been, to us in Ireland in blood and religion, their efforts to govern independent of Irish opinion resulted in failure. How much less likely is it that they can succeed here without availing themselves of your assistance more largely than heretofore.

In our efforts for reform and constitutional liberty, much will depend upon individual character and training ; upon the extent to which we wisely administer the powers we have. The English are not naturally better or braver than other peoples. They owe their success partly to high average reliability and a high sense of duty. What they personally undertake they usually perform. Like others, they are moved by selfish considerations ; but having, in politics of administrative office, once engaged for the public weal, they are not apt to neglect it for private interests ; they can rely upon each other. Let us take pattern by them in these respects.

While most anxious not to implicate your cause with Irish politics, or the relations between Great Britain and Ireland, I may occasionally illustrate your affairs by reference to my own country. Your interests are in fact closely involved in some effectual settlement of the Irish question. One of your principal and most just complaints is that no sufficient attention is given to your affairs in Parliament. Whilst months are allotted to the consideration of the British budget, a few hours are grudged to yours. Parliament is paralysed with work. It has undertaken functions it cannot perform. Three separate Parliaments had enough to do to manage the affairs of England, Scotland, and Ireland. They were merged into one when the population of the United Kingdom was only fifteen millions. That population has now risen to thirty-eight millions. Parliament has, moreover, undertaken to care for your two hundred and eighty millions. The sphere of law is becoming both wider and more minute. Surely Parliament ought to be more of an Imperial, less of a local, assembly. For generations to come, England, the heart of the Empire, must have the preponderating influence in Imperial Councils. That we grant. You, who are Indian, and I, who am Irish, trust that our Imperial rights will not suffer from that preponderating English influence. But at present the Imperial Parliament is occupied largely with the affairs of under five millions of people, and ministries rise and fall on the question of Ireland rather than great Imperial interests. The entire Empire is concerned in the speedy settlement of the Irish question.

We hold to Imperial unity, undisputed and intact. To question this would be idle, nor do we question it, and we do not desire to question it. We believe that the period of small states—too often a burden alike to themselves and to the world, with their dissensions and wars,—is rapidly passing away and that a better era is dawning, when, under the ægis of immensely powerful states, the peoples can rest secure and enjoy real liberty. The series of events by which this change has been wrought is sufficiently painful, often unutterably shocking. We may well turn with horror from the record. I for one would rather be descended from those who rest in the graves of the conquered than from those who rode with victors. There is no true glory in mere domination. In public places and museums I turn with shame from the pitiful trophies torn from subjected peoples. We must however accept the conditions of these changes. Let us enjoy their benefits, which are many. After all, the external prestige of nationality is not the important consideration. Individual liberty, the wise administration of local affairs, the educating of a responsible population, these are of far greater consequence. And Imperial unity cannot realise its full strength and will not fulfil its true functions until all are trained to enjoy these benefits, and these benefits are extended to all. What man of ordinary intelligence could prefer Russian despotism to British freedom? British power in India will remain invulnerable against foreign aggrandisement so long as you believe that with the spread of modern ideas and education, which are largely due to British rule, will come an extension of English liberty.

There is no possibility of turning back. Once imbue nations with aspirations

for progress and enlightenment, and they must go forwards towards liberty. For fifty years the Anglo-Indian Government has been urging you to educate yourselves, to imbibe principles of constitutional liberty, to obliterate old divisions, to break down caste prejudices, to rise to the level of British citizenship, and unite for the good of a common country. Taking up Sir William Hunter's *History of the Indian Peoples*, the first sentence that rivetted my attention was one in which it is desired that the Anglo-Indian schools should "become the nurseries of a self-respecting nation." The towers of a university were the first object that met my gaze the morning after my arrival in India. Nationality has well been defined in your debates as "the aggregate of those who are citizens of one country" [one definite geographical unit] "subordinate to one power, subject to one supreme legislature, taxed by one authority, influenced for weal and woe by one system of administration, urged by like impulses to secure like rights and to be relieved of like burdens. * * It has for its central stock, like the trunk of a tree, the people who have for ages and generations settled and domiciled in a country with more or less ethnic identity at the bottom, and more or less unified by being continually subjected to identical environments and to the inevitable process of assimilation." Those who accept any such definitions circle in narrow grooves of thought if they believe that such nationality is inimical to Imperial strength and unity. It may in truth be its outcome and its crown.

Politics are amongst the most ennobling, most comprehensive spheres of human activity and none should eventually be excluded from their exercise. There is much that is ludicrous, much that is sad, much that is deplorable about them. Yet they remain, and ever will remain, the most effective field upon which to work for the good of our fellows. The political atmosphere, that which we here hope to breathe, is one into which no thought of "greed or lust, or low ambition" should enter. We desire the good of all. We work for all. No class, however lowly, however despised, must be shut out from our sympathies and our endeavours—from the expectations of that great future towards which we all yearn. We desire not alone the brotherhood of man, but the brotherhood and sisterhood of men and women. In proportion as men and women sympathise with each other, take part in each other's pursuits, and strive for the common weal, in such proportion is public life elevated and purified. Amongst women are some of your best and most earnest friends in the United Kingdom.

Admitting the paramount necessity for the maintenance of the unity of the Empire, we know that all questions relating to arms and the armed forces of the Crown must be treated with circumspection. We must weigh well our words and the difficulties of the situation.

In Ireland during most of my lifetime it has been a penal offence to carry them without license, and licenses are strictly guarded. In India you rest under closer restrictions. Some modification of the rules under the Arms Act is necessary, "so as to make them equally applicable to all residents in, or visitors to, India without distinction of creed, caste, or colour; to ensure the liberal concession

of licenses wherever wild animals habitually destroy human life, cattle, or crops; and to make all licenses granted under the revised rules of lifelong tenure revocable only on proof of misuse and valid throughout the provincial jurisdiction in which they are issued." With us the prohibitions are an insult to the soil; with you, to the race.

Nothing is more striking in considering the condition of India than its poverty compared with the wealth of the rest of the Western world, especially with the United Kingdom. (The riches of Great Britain are so enormous that the poverty of Ireland scarcely affected the general average.) The mean annual income of the inhabitants of the United Kingdom has been estimated at £ 33-14s.; that of the people of India, at from Rs. 20 to Rs. 27. Mr. Fowler, in his ministerial statement this year, dwelt upon the comparative lightness of the burthen of Indian taxation compared with that in the United Kingdom, foregetting that 5 per cent. on an income of Rs. 20 is a much heavier burthen then 7½ per cent. on £ 33. It is impossible, upon any basis of fair-play, to justify debiting you with so many large items, such as the India Office and India Office expenses, recruiting depots, loss on exchange, and the like, which really form a portion of the British home charges. If the maintenance of the Indian Empire is so essential to British prestige and greatness, if the honour and glory are to be Britain's, surely she, not you, should bear the heavy burthens. She does not attempt to collect similar charges from the Colonies.

The aggregate *annual savings* of the United Kingdom in the years between 1840 and 1888 have been estimated at £ 110,000,000, or over £ 300,000 a day. Such accumulations of wealth, combined with parsimonious dealings with poorer peoples, are irreconcilable with real belief in the precepts of righteousness.

The expenditure upon the army in India, which in 1882-83 stood at Rx. 18,359,000 (including Rx. 17,000 for Afghanistan and Rx. 1,308,000 for Egypt), had in 1893 risen by 27 per cent. to Rx. 23,877,000. Any advantages to be derived from this increased expenditure have not been shared in alike by native and by British troops. The pensions of European officers have been raised 37 per cent.; of native officers only 11 per cent. Thirteen per cent. more per man is spent upon the British rank and file; 4 per cent. less per man upon the native rank and file.

Your taxes spent abroad have risen from Rx. 17,369,000 in 1882 by 31 per cent. to Rx. 22,911,000 in 1892. In the former year they amounted to 23 per cent., in the latter to 25 per cent. of your total expenditure. No country could permanently afford such a drain. These increases are not materially due to alterations in the rate of exchange.

These startling facts demand grave consideration east and west of Suez, apart from the daily deteriorating condition of agriculture generally. I am not competent enough to speak on the state of your peasantry, but so far as all accounts go, official included, there are strong grounds to apprehend danger from the agricultural condition of the country. I am aware that this problem constantly engages the

attention of the Supreme Government, and it is to be hoped that it will take a new departure in its policy of land revenue. Mere palliatives will never do. A judicious and statesmanlike survey of the existing situation should enable it to devise a satisfactory remedy. Whatever action may be taken to free the impoverished peasantry from the hands of the money-lenders will go a great way to ameliorate their condition. And Government itself should modify its cast-iron system of exacting revenue at dates at which the cultivators are least prepared to discharge the State dues. We must, however, not take a gloomy view of the situation. If you have greater difficulties to contend with than we in Ireland, you will remember that your population has been increasing, whilst ours has been reduced by over 40 per cent. within the past half century. Whilst you have lee-way to make up in education and material advancement, your relative progress has been and is out of all proportion to ours.

The justice of, and necessity for, adequate representation in our superior and local Councils is apparent, and naturally claims much of your attention. The administrative mutilation of the manifest intentions of Parliament in framing the Indian Councils Act is much to be deplored. I see that complaints have been made in every province where the enlarged Councils are established; that the distribution of seats for representation of the people is most unsatisfactory; and that while some interests are over-represented, other important interests are not represented at all. This is not in accordance with the expressed views of British statesmen on both sides of the House when the Bill was discussed. Mr. Gladstone said: "I believe I am justified in looking forward, not merely to a nominal, but to a real living representation of the people of India." Lord Salisbury was no less emphatic: "If we are to do it, and if it has to be done, let us do it systematically * * taking care that the machinery to be provided shall effect the purpose of giving representation, not to accidentally constituted bodies, not to small sections of the people here and there, but to the living strength and vital forces of the whole community of India." How little have these anticipations been realized. We have here a striking instance of the extent to which administration can defeat the intentions of legislation.

It is indeed almost more necessary for the contentment of a people that they should have the administration than the enactment of laws. It is moreover desirable that judicial should, as far as possible, be separated from executive functions, that civil and military employments in medical and other departments should not be held by the same persons. The average military officer, supreme in his own sphere, is, of all others, least suited by his training to administer civil affairs in a sympathetic and conciliatory spirit. It has been well said that "the frame of mind necessary for an executive officer and the frame of mind necessary for a judge are different. Executive officers ought to mix freely with the people, they ought to try to make friends with them, they ought to see this, and they ought to see that; a judge, on the contrary, ought to shut his ears against everything except that which comes before him in court. But an executive officer has as such to

learn everything and to do everything, and when he comes upon the bench, he is expected to divest his mind of whatever he has heard elsewhere. Even the best officer of Government is after all a human being.

You have properly protested against the curtailment of your rights regarding trial by jury. Whether we compare the number of convictions before and since the institution of the system thirty years ago, or the state of affairs in districts where it was not established with that where it was established, there appears nothing to justify recent changes. Officials sometimes forget that the general attitude of the people towards the law is of more consequence than the number of malefactors sentenced. It is an old principle of English jurisprudence that it is better that many guilty should escape than that one innocent man should suffer. Love of law, the conception that it is for the good of all—so deeply implanted in the hearts of sovereign peoples, who have been able to mould it to their will—is naturally a plant of slow growth with peoples less favoured.

Regarding criminal procedure in India, the public conscience at home has been from time to time outraged by instances that have reached us of what appeared to be undue partiality towards Europeans. A number of such cases have been summed up in a book by Ram Gopal Sanyal recently published in Calcutta. The Dum Dum and the Guntakul cases appeared to many of us in Parliament disastrous miscarriages of justice, detrimental to British prestige, the outcome of that brutal contempt for your people which is unhappily still characteristic of many ignorant and prejudiced Europeans, of that race hatred which ought to be the Government's first care to stamp out. The very appearance or suspicion of judging the efficiency of magistrates and police by their success in securing convictions ought surely to be avoided. We all hope that the Government of India, whose desire for impartiality and justice we all admit, is keenly alive to these evils and will try its best to consider favourably your representations on the subject. I trust that ere long they may be removed.

Meanwhile let us not embitter our lives, or weaken our energies for practical work. Human justice is after all fallible justice. We all fall short where our own interests are concerned! Let what we believe to be injustice by others impel us to higher standards, to nobler ideals of life, to wider charity and forgiveness, to deeper trust in an Omniscience that will yet right every wrong and wipe the tear from every eye.

We rejoiced on the adoption of Mr. Paul's motion regarding simultaneous examinations; still more at the frank spirit in which it appeared to have been accepted by the Government. We thought it a great step forward—a solid advantage gained. We have been correspondingly disappointed by the extent to which official counsels have since prevailed to the reversal by a Liberal Cabinet of the solemn decision then arrived at. Such vacillation tends to weaken the power of the House of Commons. We have lately seen it used as a reason why the Upper Chamber should properly set at naught the resolutions of the Lower. When public opinion has secured the acceptance by the House of such a great principle, it has a right

to consider its work accomplished. I but voice the pain which this proceeding has caused to many of the most ardent supporters of the Government.

Upon the other hand, few actions of the present Government are more indicative of the progress of liberal ideas than the recent convention with Japan for the aboilition of Consular jurisdiction. This convention may not be without hopeful significance regarding your future. How comes it that powers considered inexpedient to accord to Indian judges trained in British law have freely, and almost without comment, been granted to their brethren in Japan.

The education of the peoples claims the first attention of Government now-a-days. I regret that in your case the expenditure thereupon bears such a small proportion to that for military purposes. We must, however, individually bear in mind—at least with us in the United Kingdom there is need to bear in mind—that education in itself confers no special claim to employment by the State. Education fits us for life and enables us the better to use and to enjoy life. It widens our horizon. But we must not expect too much from it. It should be a blessing to all; it might easily be a curse to some—if it spoiled them for the proper discharge of the simple duties that come nearest to them.

I desire now to refer to three subjects—Drink, the Regulation of Vice, and Opium—which have more particularly interested many British friends of India. In this connection I must confess that, as a member of a professedly Christian land, I am almost ashamed to stand before you. Christians claim to carry a message of love and enlightenment to the world. You and we have come together; and what have been the consequences? Have you wronged us, or have we wronged you? Have you for individual gain forced ruin and demoralization upon us, or have we forced them upon you? These questions carry their own answers. We owe our highest civilization and culture originally to the East. In return we have handed back some benefits, but also some of the lowest products of Western civilization.

As to the Drink curse (largely introduced and widely extended by us), there has been repeated denunciations in your debates. It has formed the subject of a resolution at more than one Congress. The spread in India of this evil is fully discussed in the debate on the "Reform in excise administration" at your sixth and eighth Congresses. It is deplorable to hear that "people have become more addicted to drink, because it has been thought to be an adjunct of Western civilization;" that "it has been left for [your] Christian rulers to love it, stimulate it, and pet it, and make money by millions of pounds out of it." In this Presidency the excise license appears to have increased five-fold within forty years. I understand that in India as a whole it has doubled within twenty years. The East India Company, ostensibly at least, strove to reduce consumption. Can we believe that such is the object of Government at the present day? There is scarcely a family in the United Kingdom that has not suffered from the ravages of drink. I am one of those who believe that the safety only lies in complete abstinence. To many peoples our introduction of it has meant annihilation. You cannot be too

much upon your guard against its insidious advances. I rejoice that the attention you have given to the subject has already contributed in the Madras Government alone to the closure of thousands of liquor shops. In such respects as these I have long been of the opinion that the crimes committed by society through Government against the people are often greater and less excusable and more disgraceful to character than the worst crimes ever committed by the people against society and against Government. The former are deliberate and far reaching. In a certain sense they are without justification, and every citizen is responsible. The latter have generally been committed by the irresponsible few in moments of excitement.

With regard to the odious Cantonment Acts, your testimony has been clear and true. At Allahabad in 1888 you unanimously resolved "That this Congress, having watched with interest and sympathy the exertions that are being made in England for the total abrogation of laws and rules relating to the regulation of prostitution by the State in India, places on record its appreciation of the services thus rendered to this country, and its desire to co-operate by all means in its power in the attainment of this laudable object." This must have had considerable influence with the Home Government in the changes which it has prescribed and which the Government in India is now so tardily carrying out. The history of this question is most significant from the 9th July 1887, when Lord Cross telegraphed to the Viceroy : "I apprehend system is indefensible and must be condemned," till 11th August 1893, when Lord Roberts had the manliness to apologize to Mrs. Andrew and Dr. Kate Bushnell for having denied the accuracy of their revelations upon the subject. But for the ability and devotion of these American ladies, officials would still conceal the truth from the British public, as they managed to conceal it even from the responsible head of the responsible department. What a commentary upon Indian administration ! What an argument for local representation ! That system of administration is indeed faulty which admits of simply docketing, without obeying, instructions that do not meet the approval of officials. It is easy, but cannot be permanent. For the first time—I say it without meaning offence—the methods of the Indian administration have been fully exposed; and since they have been detected in one particular, we at home must beware of too blindly trusting them in others.

To Opium I find little reference in your proceedings. It is a subject which engages the attention of many of the more thoughtful and conscientious of your friends. There are difficulties surrounding it. No doubt, we in the United Kingdom for our own purposes encouraged the use of the drug, spread its cultivation, and forced it upon China. How are we to retrace our steps? Certainly not at your expense. The decrease of the revenue from this source by 16 per cent. within the past ten years is a warning that it cannot permanently be depended upon. Consideration for the rights of your Independent States complicates the problem. I cannot here initiate discussion upon it. Your business for this Session is already planned and cannot be altered. However,

at some time, to us in the United Kingdom, who desire to do our duty in this matter, your knowledge and advice would be helpful.

The reforms we desire are not likely to be accomplished, your cause cannot be effectually pleaded, until you are satisfactorily represented alike in your Provincial Councils and in the Imperial Parliament. In proportion as each class and each interest within the United Kingdom has come to have its voice heard in the Imperial Parliament, in just such proportion has that assembly been strengthened and dignified. That strength and that dignity will undoubtedly at some period be increased by representation from the component parts of the Empire. If the Empire is, as we believe it to be, one and indivisible, one indivisible spirit of liberty must pervade every portion of it. If all cannot eventually be raised to one level, all may equally be lowered. If absolutism is necessary here, absolutism will certainly taint and ultimately undermine the fabric of English liberty. Already the workings of ascendancy in India have not been without their influence in retarding steady liberal progress in the United Kingdom.

I have thus ventured, within the short time at my disposal, carefully to lay before you my views regarding the questions that have most engaged your attention and are likely again to come up for discussion. You may the better appreciate the spirit in which I landed upon your shores and in which I shall follow your debates.

We may proceed to our task with hope and confidence. Within the lifetime of a generation, you have obtained what may be regarded as the first instalment of reform in the direction of the expansion and reconstruction of the Legislative Councils, which has cost other countries centuries of toil and effort. You have every reason to be proud of what you have achieved in other directions. You must not be cooled by temporary discouragements, by the unfaithfulness of some, the want of faith of the many. Reform progresses like the steady rise of the tide through many an ebb and flow of the waves. Confident are we that through all storm and cloud the sun of constitutional liberty will yet shine with pure and beneficent effulgence upon your country. Let it be your individual care to carry back from these Congresses into every-day life and every-day occupations true elevation of mind, belief in your future and your own power to mould your future. This future depends more upon yourselves than upon any political or financial changes. Before all you must cultivate a spirit of generous toleration and of charity between class and class and creed and creed.

Considering the general advancement of the world, from which no portion of its surface can be permanently excluded, we have every cause for encouragement, every incentive to press forward, setting no limits to the possible material and spiritual advancement of mankind. Never before were men and women so alive to their capabilities and to their responsibilities towards each other. Let us advance together in ever-widening combinations, with ever-broadening hopes, labouring for the good of all.

"For oh! it were a gallant deed
To show before mankind,

How every race and every creed
Might be by love combined—
Might be combined, yet not forget
The fountains whence they rose
As, filled by many a rivulet,
The stately Ganges flows."

One of your sages has compared the soul of man to a bird, and earthly existence to the period marked by its flight through a room—out of the illimitable into the illimitable. By devoting ourselves to the good of others, we can best occupy that brief space. The wise assertion of common rights is enlightened altruism.

Here I bring to a conclusion this address, as, with the exception of a few sentences, I had prepared it in Ireland on the occasion. Since then, I have landed in India, have seen some of your Schools and Colleges, have lingered in the crowded streets of your cities, have listened to the hum of your manufactures, have talked with your leaders, have watched the sun rise and set on the plains where such a large proportion of your population hardly wring their living from the soil. I now somewhat realise the surpassing beauty of your land. I have met you here face to face. How faint and weak, how inadequate the expression of my inmost feelings is what I have written and read, apart from those family and national ties which to each one of us are the first of life's blessings, the choicest gifts of God. I regard this visit to India, this permission to take part in the proceedings of this august assemblage as the highest privilege that has ever fallen to my lot, one that cannot but profoundly influence my remaining years. Two convictions before all others press themselves in upon me. The one, the greatness of the mission of the United Kingdom in this land, apart from its inception and much of its history. The other, that this Congress movement is the necessary and logical outcome, the richest fruit of that noble mission of which we English, Scotch, and Irish people should be proud. You yourselves are taking up the work, the work which you and you alone can ultimately perfect—"the eradication by direct friendly "intercourse of all possible race, creed or national prejudices amongst all lovers of your country." This is, in truth, the greatest combined peaceful effort for the good of the largest member of the human race that History has recorded.

Eleventh Congress—Poona—1895.

Hon. SURENDRANATH BANNERJEE.

BROTHER DELEGATES, LADIES AND GENTLEMEN, I thank you heartily for electing me as President of this Congress. I can conceive of no higher honor—no loftier trust—no more exalted dignity—than that to which you have summoned me by your united suffrages. The highest reward which in these days a public man may receive, next to the approbation of his own conscience, is the confidence of his fellow-countrymen. For him what higher mark of honor or what nobler incentive to duty could there be than his election as the President of an assembly like this, which is the non-official Parliament of his nation? But great as the honor is, far higher is the responsibility which belongs to it. It is a part of the divine arrangement that where there is a privilege there is also a corresponding duty. Your president is not only your speaker; he is something more. It is his duty to maintain order, to regulate your proceedings and to facilitate the despatch of your business. Having regard to the magnitude of this assembly, this in itself would make a heavy demand upon the resources, physical and mental, of the strongest and the ablest among us. But your President has other duties imposed upon him. During the three days that the Congress is in session he is your spokesman, your organ, the right arm of your strength. He voices forth the spirit which animates you in your deliberations, the temper which guides you in the solemn and arduous task which lies before you. One may well stagger at a responsibility so vast and so manysided; but your forbearance and generosity is the saving element in the situation. The moment you induct any one into this chair—the moment you install him in his office—from that moment you accord him in an unstainted measure your sympathy and your support. You forgive him his faults—you overlook his mistakes—you help him in his task—and you send him forth to his work, with your prayers and your benedictions. It has been truly remarked that the manner in which people conduct themselves at a public meeting is some evidence of their capacity for self-Government. Judged by this test you are past-masters in the art. (*Cheers*) For I know of no assembly more orderly in its conduct, more deferential to constituted authority, more firm in its adherence to its programme and yet withal more moderate in the expression thereof than these yearly gatherings of the National Congress. (*Hear, hear.*) Nay more, weak as your President may be, he and the Congress are supported by an unseen force of immense potency. The good wishes of the educated community follow us. They are present in spirit, if not present in body. They are watching our deliberations with intense interest. They pour forth their heart's prayer for the success of our work. (*Loud Cheers*)

I was not a little amused and interested to read in an English newspaper the

other day a statement to the effect that the women of my province had idolized the Congress, and that it had duly found its place in the Hindu pantheon. The fact is laid hold of by the writer as evidence of the superstition and ignorance of the people and their incapacity for representative institutions. I was not aware that any responsible Congressman had ever asked for representative institutions for our women or for the masses of our people. However much we may love and respect our ladies, we do not think they are yet qualified for representative government. They are not even supposed to be qualified in England. Our demand is much more limited. We should be satisfied if we obtain representative institutions of a modified character for the educated community who by reason of their culture and enlightenment, their assimilation of English ideas and their familiarity with English methods of Government might be presumed to be qualified for such a boon. But it would be useless to traverse the statement or the inference which is sought to be deduced from it. It would be almost cruel to dissipate the little romance which has gathered round our great movement. But this I will say on your behalf, that God or no God, whether the Congress has found a place in the Hindu pantheon or not, it is enshrined in the hearts of the educated community of India—it excites their deepest reverence, stirs their most earnest enthusiasm—it is the God of their idolatry—it is indissolubly bound up with and forms part and parcel of the life of New India. (*Loud and Prolonged Cheers.*)

In addressing you on this occasion it is impossible not to advert for a moment to the circumstance of the Congress being held at Poona. This is the first time the Congress assembles in this great historical city. It was purely an accident that deprived Poona of the honor of being the birth-place of the Congress. The first Congress was to have been held here, but sickness broke out in the city, and the *venue* had to be changed to Bombay. But though deprived of this honor by an untoward accident, your citizens and the people of the Deccan at large have had a great hand in the up-building of the Congress. Nearly two centuries ago your ancestors built up an Empire which contented with Britain for supremacy in India. But those days of strife are past and gone. If war has its victories, peace also has her triumphs; and this Congress will remain to you and to those who have worked with you as a monument of your energy and of your devotion to the country in these times, when the triumphs of peace are the most enduring.

It would be mere affectation on my part were I to ignore those events which preceded the session of the Congress at Poona, and which for a time at least filled the public mind of India with alarm and anxiety. I am a stranger to your local politics and your local feeling. I have no right to judge. I have not the means to judge. Who am I that I should judge? But spectators sometimes see more of the game than the actual players. And this I will venture to say that those who were in favour of the Social Conference being held in the *Pandal* and those who were opposed to it were all animated by one common sentiment of devotion to the Congress movement. They differed in their methods. We who stand outside your local controversies, while we sympathise with the deep-seated convictions of al

parties and admire the noble sacrifice which the Secretary of the Conference has made to restore amity and concord, must ask you to exercise mutual charity, and forbearance to forget and to forgive, and to unite in one common effort to make this Congress, worthy of the Capital of *Maharashtra*, and an example to all future Congresses. In this connection I cannot help expressing my sense of admiration at the conciliatory attitude so strikingly displayed by Mr. Justice Ranade, Secretary of the Social Conference, at a critical stage in history of the controversy to which I have referred. It averted a crisis which might have proved disastrous to the best interests of the Congress. The Congress owes a heavy debt of gratitude to Mr. Justice Ranade.

We cannot afford to have a schism in our camp. Already they tell us that it is a Hindu Congress, although the presence of our Mahomedan friends completely contradicts the statement. Let it not be said that this is the Congress of one social party rather than that of another. It is the Congress of united India, of Hindus and Mahomedans, of Christians, of Parsees and of Sikhs, of those who would reform their social customs and those who would not. Here we stand upon a common platform—here we have all agreed to bury our social and religious differences, and recognise the one common fact that being subjects of the same Sovereign and living under the same Government and the same political institutions, we have common rights and common grievances. And we have called forth this Congress into existence with a view to safe guard and extend our rights and redress our grievances. What should we say of a Faculty of Doctors who fell out, because though in perfect accord as to the principles of their science, they could not agree as to the age at which they should marry their daughters, or whether they should re-marry their widowed daughters or not.

The Congress has now been in existence for eleven years. We have not as yet got a written constitution, though, I hope, we shall provide ourselves with one before we separate. But there has grown around us a body of usages, the unwritten customary law of the Congress, which govern our movement. If there is one principle more than another, which is uniformly accepted, and universally assented to, it is this—that no matter what differences of opinion may exist among us as regards religious beliefs or social usages, they shall be no bar to our acting together in Congress—they shall not be permitted to interrupt the cordiality of our relations as Congressmen. Never was the truth of this remark more strikingly illustrated than in connection with the agitation on the Consent Bill. Congressmen and Congressleaders arrayed themselves on opposite sides. Sir Romesh Chunder Mitter, whose ill-health we all deplore, and who if he were better would probably have occupied the chair which I so unworthily fill, strenuously opposed the Bill; our great leader, Mr. Allan Hume, was as strenuously in favour of it. Our political opponents fanned the flames. They looked forward to an approaching schism. They were disappointed. We rapidly closed our ranks. This controversy took place in the early part of 1891: the Congress of 1891 held at Nagpur was as successful as any of the previous Congresses had been. Ours is

a political and not a social movement; and it cannot be made a matter of complaint against us that we are not a social organization any more than it can be urged against any of my lawyer friends that they are not doctors. Even in regard to political matters, such is our respect for the opinions of minorities, that so far back as 1887, I think it was at the instance of Mr. Budruddin Tyabji, who once was our President and whose elevation to the Bench of the Bombay High Court is a matter of national congratulation, a resolution was passed to the effect that where there is practical unanimity among a class, though in a minority in the Congress, that a question should not be discussed, it should forthwith be abandoned. We who show such great respect for the opinions of others deserve at least an equal measure of consideration from all, be they friends or be they otherwise.

There is special danger to which an organization, such as ours, is exposed and which must be guarded against. In the days of its infancy, when it is persecuted and reviled, the members stand fast together, their cohesion is great, and the compactness of the organization is in proportion to the pressure of adverse circumstances brought to bear upon it. But when these days are past and gone, when the sun of prosperity begins to shine upon it, when the prestige of victory comes to be associated with its honored name, when opposition has dwindled down to the proportions of an occasional and feeble protest, uttered by some journalist who is not abreast of the times and who has not perhaps forgotten his old love for the movement, then we are confronted with the danger of there being developed from within the seeds of dissension and dispute. Relieved from the pressure of adverse circumstances, the cohesion of the members is apt to grow less, their enthusiasm to cool and the consistency of the organization to give way to the demoralizing influence of success.

I am sure we have not yet arrived at that stage. We are still exposed to the taunts and jeers of our opponents—we are still regarded as a set of impracticable people whose knowledge of all things, specially of finance, leaves much room for improvement. Our progress though satisfactory, considering our opportunities and the short time we have been in existence as an organization, is insignificant when compared with what we have yet to achieve before we reach the goal of our aspirations, the promised land of equal freedom and of equal rights with British subjects, which has ever been the dream of Congress leaders, and which when realized will constitute, in the words of the late Sir Madhava Row, the soundest triumph of British administration and a crown of glory to British rule. Having regard to our achievements in the past, the possibilities which unfold themselves in the future, and the trust we have assumed to safeguard and extend the sphere of our rights, we should be false to ourselves if we did not stand shoulder to shoulder, forgetful of all differences, in the one common endeavour to uphold the national interests as represented by the Congress.

This leads me to the question of the constitution of the Congress. Having regard to recent events we must accord to it the fore-front place—the place of honor—in our debates. I have referred to the usages, the unwritten law, of the

Congress. It must be admitted that the time has come when we must clearly define these usages, and accord to them the deliberate and authoritative sanction of the Congress. The need of a constitution was felt very early in the history of our movement. We are fighting a constitutional battle, and it was felt that we should place our organisation upon a constitutional basis. So far back as the year 1887 at the third session of the Congress held at Madras, the very first Resolution that was passed was a Resolution appointing a Committee to draft a set of rules to be laid before the Congress on the last day of its sitting. I will read to you the Resolution :—

"That a Committee be appointed consisting of the gentlemen marginally enumerated to consider what rules, if any, may now be usefully framed in regard to the institution and working of the Congress with instructions to report thereon on the 30th instant."

In accordance with this resolution the Committee reported on the 30th December, and a resolution was passed to the effect that the rules be circulated to the Standing Congress Committees who were to work on them so far as practicable, and to report thereon to the next Congress. Let me reproduce the text of the Resolution :—

"That the rules drafted by the Committee appointed under resolution—stand over for consideration till next Congress, but that in the meantime copies be circulated to all Standing Congress Committees with the request that they will during the coming year act in accordance with these rules so far as they may seem to them possible and desirable, and report thereon to the next Congress with such further suggestions as to them may seem meet."

I regret to have to say that the matter was not reported to the next Congress which met at Allahabad and was not considered by them. It was not considered till 1894 at the Madras Congress of last year. In 1893 when the Congress met at Lahore, a strongly-felt wish was expressed in favour of providing the Congress with a constitution without further loss of time. It was, I think, those good and self-sacrificing men connected with the Anglo-Vedic College who urged upon us the need of a constitution. They pointed to their own great College as evidence of what might be done by organised effort proceeding upon a constitutional basis. Nothing however was done in 1893. It was too late to discuss the question. In 1894 at the last session of the Congress held in Madras, the matter was again considered when the following Resolution was passed :—

"That this Congress is of opinion that the time has come when the constitution of the Congress should be settled and rules and regulations laid down as to the number of delegates, their qualifications, the localities for assemblage and the like, and with this view the Congress requests the Standing Committee of Poona to draw up draft rules and circulate them among the different Standing Congress Committees for their report ; these reports together with the draft rules and the report thereon to be laid before the next Congress for consideration."

The Poona Committee have, I understand, at the last moment drawn up a body of rules which they have circulated to the Congress Committees. The Standing Congress Committees have not considered these rules and the reports are not before us. I have not the smallest desire to excuse the Standing Congress Committees elsewhere at the expense of the Poona Committee. They might easily have moved in the matter and appealed to the Poona Committee ; but they took no

action—they slept over the matter. I think we must all share the responsibility of this tardy action on the part of the Poona Committee. We are never tired of reminding the Government of their broken promises. The one charge which we urge against the Government—which we repeat *ad nauseam*,—which we reiterate in season and out of season, is that they have made large promises which they have only inadequately redeemed, and that the measure of their performances falls short of the measure of their promises. Are we not in all conscience amenable to the same charge? We have more than once solemnly undertaken to provide the Congress with a constitution. More than once have we broken this promise. Our declarations are a dead letter. We have not carried them out. But it is no use lamenting over the past. Let the dead past bury their dead. Let us retrieve the mistakes and omissions of the past. Let us, before we separate, have a few well-defined rules which will embody existing practice and obviate future difficulties. We may follow the precedent set by the Madras Congress of 1887; appoint a committee to frame rules on the first day with instructions to report on or before the last day of the Congress. We need not circulate these rules to the Standing Congress Committees. That is the old plea for inaction. We shall not have any rules at all if we are to repeat the hapless experiment of former years. Nor need our rules be like the laws of the Medes and the Persians, rigid and inflexible, admitting of no change, no modification. If we find any rule working badly, there is nothing to prevent our changing it. I earnesty appeal to you, brother-delegates, as a fellow-worker and an old Congress-man to apply yourselves to this task. It will be evidence of your practical wisdom, of your ready recognition of public opinion, and of your capacity to adapt yourselves to the environments of your situation. A Congress with a constitution would be far more potent for good than a Congress without a constitution. A representative body, like the Congress, organized upon a constitutional basis, cannot long exist by the side of a bureaucratic Government without powerfully influencing it for good. A Congress with a constitution would be the living protest of the educated community against a form of administration, where the will of the few and not the voice of the many prevails.

From the consideration of the constitution of the Congress we pass on to discuss the constitution of the Government of this country; and as in our own case, so also here, much remains to be done. At this stage, and standing upon the vantage-ground we happen to occupy, we may pause for a moment to take a brief retrospect of the past, if only to derive from it the inspiration and guidance for the future. The illustrious men—I feel the less hesitation in bearing my humble testimony to their worth, as I was not one of them—who founded the Congress at Bombay—some of whom are dead and gone, whose memories we revere, and the memory of none do we cherish with a greater measure of reverence than that of the young, the versatile, the brilliant Kashinath Trimbak Telang—these illustrious men did not in their wildest dreams anticipate the great future which awaited their movement. In this connection I am reminded of the exquisite lines of Longfellow which occur in his "Spanish Student" describing the spirit which pervades the

achievements of the man of genius. The man of genius, says he, finds around him.

" All the means of action.

The shapeless masses,—the materials ;

They lie everywhere around him. Footsore and weary with travel he comes, and with the uncouth charcoal he inscribes on the wall. And lo and behold ! transfigured by the magic of his touch,

" All its hidden virtues shine.

* * * *

It gleams a diamond. "

The forces were there ; the materials were there ; they lay in shapeless masses. The hour had come ; the men were there. They communicated to them the Promethean spark, the celestial fire which made them instinct with life, and under their controlling guidance the Congress has developed into a movement fraught with unspeakable blessings to generations of my countrymen yet unborn. The birth of the Congress had, indeed, been foreseen by the great men who had been associated with the Anglo-Indian Government in the early stages of its progressive development. Macaulay, speaking from his place in Parliament on the occasion of the enactment of the Charter Act, used language which had about it the ring of prophetic inspiration. " It may be, " said he, " that the public mind of India may so expand under our system as to outgrow that system ; that our subjects, being brought up under good Government, may develope a capacity for better Government, that being instructed in European knowledge they may crave for European institutions. I know not whether such a day will ever come, but when it does come, it will be the proudest day in the annals of England. " We have met to celebrate this day, the proudest in the annals of England and India. The National Congress is the outcome of those civilizing influences which Macaulay and his coadjutors were instrumental in implanting in the Government of this country. It has a brilliant record. I will claim this for the Congress that it has not taken up a single question which it has not brought within the range of practical politics, or which it has not brought nearer to solution. You took up the question of the separation of Judicial and Executive functions. It has been declared to be a counsel of perfection by so high an authority as Lord Dufferin. You took up the Excise question. In my Province, in the more crowded districts, the outstills have been abolished. You agitated for the reform of the Police. In my Province a Police Commission was appointed, and, though the Police remains very much what it was, I must say that a genuine effort is being made by the Government to give effect to the recommendations of the Commission. You insisted in season and out of season upon the wider employment of our countrymen in the higher offices of State. The Public Service Commission was appointed ; and, though I cannot congratulate the Government upon the manner in which it has dealt with the recommendations of the Commission, as the outcome of their deliberations, the maximum limit of age for the Open Competitive Examination was raised. Last but not least, is the crowning triumph of the Congress in the recognition by the Government of the representative element in the reconstitution of the enlarged Councils.

But the subjective triumphs of the Congress—its moral victories—are even more remarkable than its outward achievements. You have introduced a new spirit into the country. You have infused a new enthusiasm into your countrymen. You have brought together the scattered elements of a vast and diversified population—you have welded them into a compact and homogeneous mass—you have made them vibrate with the new-born sentiment of an awakened nationality—you have unified them for the common purposes of their political enfranchisement. Along with the new-born impulse which you have thus communicated, and which draws its inspiration from the living examples of English greatness, you have placed before your countrymen lofty ideals of public duty, which are slowly transforming the national character, imparting to the flexibility of the East, the stamina and the stability of the West. Above all, you have taught your countrymen to glory in the British connection, and to seek to perpetuate it not by submitting to invidious and irritating distinctions, but by claiming to participate in full in the rights of British citizenship.

Hitherto we had placed the reform of the Legislative Councils in the fore front among our topics of discussion. Then came the Councils Act of 1892 which reconstituted the Councils and enlarged their functions. What is our attitude with regard to this Act? Are we satisfied with it and with the manner in which it is being worked? I am afraid we must answer the question in the negative. We regard the measure in the light of a cautious experiment which is being tried by the Government. Caution is an element of statesmanship. But caution carried to an excess—caution which is but another name for timidity—is a mistake, and may even amount to a blunder. We have no objection to the Government exercising due caution before it takes "a big jump into the unknown." Weighted with the sense of its great responsibility, the Government must look around before it makes an important departure from the lines of its ancient policy. But what we complain of is that the experiment might have been tried under conditions, more favourable to its success, more consonant to the declarations which were made in Parliament by statesmen on both sides of the House at the time of the enactment of the measure. Mr. Gladstone looked forword to a living representation of the Indian people. Lord Salisbury was anxious that the machinery provided should give representation not to small sections of the people but to the living strength and the vital forces of the whole community. Have these anticipations been realized by the light of accomplished facts? In Bengal seven elected members represent the living strength and the vital forces of a whole community of 70 millions of people. The Councils have been enlarged, but in no sense so as to provide even a tolerably moderate representation of the people. In the United Kingdom a population of 40 millions is represented by 670 members. In Bengal, a population of 70 millions is represented by only seven elected members, or, if you like, by 10 members if you take the nominated non-official members to represent the people, or by 20 members if you take the whole Council to represent the province. The result is that the election taking place under a system of rotation, whole divisions are left unrepresented in the Council. Out of the 6 Divisions in

Bengal at the present moment the Presidency Division, which is the most important, and the Chota Nagpur and Orissa Divisions, are left out in the representation. I am aware that this is a faulty arrangement which might be rectified by lumping up the Divisions, as is done elsewhere, so as to enable the whole Province to take part in the elections. But is it possible under any conceivable arrangement, by any form of administrative manipulation, to secure in the words of Mr. Gladstone, the living representation of the Indian people, or, in the words of Lord Salisbury, the representation of the whole community, and not of small sections of the people, without materially adding to the strength of the elective element in the Councils? But we are confronted with a difficulty on the very threshold. Under Section 1 of the Indian Councils Act of 1892, the maximum number of Additional Members for the Governor-General's Council is fixed at 16, and the maximum number of additional members for the Legislative Councils of Madras and Bombay is fixed at 20; and as regards Bengal and the North-Western Provinces the position seems to be still more unsatisfactory. The number of members for the Bengal Council is not to exceed 20, and that for the North-Western Provinces is not to exceed 15. Why in the Calcutta Municipality we have 75 members to represent a population of 700,000 inhabitants, and a much lesser number of rate-payers; in the District Boards in Bengal, the number varies from 10 to 40. In some of our more important Mofussil Municipalities the number is more than 20; in most Municipalities having an average income varying from Rs. 10,000 to Rs. 20,000 a year, the number is fixed at 18. But here, in the representation of great Provinces, in their Legislative Councils, the number is never to exceed 25, and is often less. I am well aware of the difficulties of the Government. They must have a standing majority in the Councils. They will say: "It is all very well for you to raise these objections. Your Counsel is a counsel of perfection, we admit. But there are practical difficulties in the way, which we, as practical administrators, must take note of. We must have a standing majority in the Councils. If we add to the elective element we must add to the number of nominated members. The requisite number of officials may not be available at the Presidency towns, or if available their appointment to the Councils may lead to serious administrative inconvenience and may involve additional expense—a matter which is not to be overlooked in these days of poverty and impecuniosity." We fully admit the force of these objections. But the difficulties are really not insuperable. They admit of easy solution. The Government need not appoint official members to the Council, to secure a majority. There are plenty of people who, though non-officials, would, in this respect, serve them better than officials. The experience of public bodies, where officials and non-officials meet for the transaction of public business, entirely confirms this view of the matter. In the Calcutta Municipality the proportion of elected members is two-thirds of the entire body. The Government is in a hopeless minority. The Chairman is an official and is appointed by the Government. He is the organ of the Government. Though in a minority, I have never known a Chairman fail to carry through any

Resolution upon which he has set his heart. Whenever he wants it he has a majority. The experience of the District Boards in Bengal entirely bears out the same view. One-half of the members are elected, the other half are nominated. The nominated members are not necessarily officials. The Chairman is the Magistrate of the District. He holds the balance of power. He is the dictator of the situation. He rules the District Boards. In the Councils the position of the Government will be still more favourable. The President will be the head of the Local Government, his prestige will be great, his personality will carry immense influence; and if the number of members be materially increased as we suggest, though only one-half of them should be nominated and among the nominated members there should be non-officials, the Government will still have a standing majority.

I say once again that if the Indian Councils Act is to be given effect to, in the spirit in which it was conceived by the distinguished statesmen who took part in its enactment, if it is to give to the people of India a living representation of the whole community and not of small sections of the people, the number of elected members must be sensibly increased; at any rate discretion should be given to the Government of India to increase the number, subject to such rules as the Government may think fit to make in that behalf. This can be easily done by a small modification of Section I of the Statute of 1892. Such a measure would strengthen the popular element in the Councils; but the Government would also share in the benefits which it would confer. A larger number of elected representatives in the Councils would place the Government in touch with the real opinion of the country. The voice that would be heard in the Councils would not be the voice of this party, or of that party, of this clique or of that, but the living voice of the Indian people.

I am well aware of the objections that will be urged against my proposal. It will be said: "You got the Councils Act amended only the other day. It is too early to think of amending it again." To that I have an obvious reply to give: It is never too early to raise the cry for reform. We must cry betimes, cry late, cry incessantly, fill the air with our importunate clamour, and then only can we hope to move the Government to take any action. *Quieta non movere*, in the words of Sir Robert Walpole, is the accepted creed of all Governments. They never move except under the irresistible pressure of a public opinion which will admit of no delay or postponement. You have your own experience to guide you in the matter. You began the agitation for the reform of the Councils in 1885. In Bengal we began it earlier, and the concession was made to us, though not in complete accordance with our anticipations or our wishes, only so recently as 1892. In making the present demand we are encouraged by the unquestionable success which has so far attended the experiment which is being tried. Sir Charles Elliott, speaking from his place as President of the Bengal Legislative Council, thus bore testimony to the distinct accession of strength to the Council which the addition of the elective element has secured:—

"I am quite satisfied in my own mind that the extension of the Council has materially added to its strength, and to its popularity, and to its power of doing good for the country. Of the Hon'ble members present there are, I think, three whose term of office will come to an end before we meet next time, and who may be re-elected or who may not. If they are re-elected, we shall welcome them back; if not, we hope we shall find in their successors, colleagues who are as generous and as zealous as they have been."

The Councils have been reconstituted, and their functions have been enlarged. The most important addition to the functions of the Councils consists in conferring upon members the right of interpellation. We are truly grateful to the Government for this right. It is an inestimable boon. No Government which did not feel strong in the strength of conscious rectitude would venture to confer such a boon upon a foreign dependency. In the dark days of the Second Empire in France, when repression was the order of the day, the Senate and the Chamber of Deputies were deprived of this right.

It was the feeling of conscious rectitude that in the main led the Executive Council of the Government of India to recommend that this right should be conferred upon Members of Council. Sir Charles Elliott has let us into the secrets of his "prison house." He told us the other day from his place as President of the Bengal Legislative Council, that Sir George Chesney argued in the Executive Council that the Government had nothing to conceal. Lord Dufferin urged that it would often help the Government to dispel false reports and to clear up misconceptions which were embarrassing to the administration. Lord Dufferin never showed greater prescience. I will here only refer to two questions that were asked in the course of this year. A few months back it was reported in one of the Anglo-Indian papers of Calcutta—the *Indian Daily News* I think it was—that the Government had it in contemplation to frame a new set of rules in connection with the Official Secrets' Act with a view to render these rules more stringent in their operation. The report created a considerable stir. Articles appeared in the newspapers; the motives of Government were aspersed. A question was put in Council. The Chief Secretary replied that there was no truth in the report, and that the Government did not mean to take any action in regard to these rules. The misconception was removed—the excitement disappeared. Take the other case. Sometime ago there appeared a very sensational account of a murder case at Chittagong in one of the newspapers, which, if true, implied a grave reflection upon the local officials. A question was put in Council. A very elaborate answer was given, and the conduct of the officials was placed in its proper light.

During the year now closing, ugly rumours were afloat to the effect that the Government intended to restrict the right. There went forth a unanimous protest against the proposed restriction from the Indian Press and from such organs of Anglo-Indian opinion as sympathised with the legitimate aspirations of the people. There was not, indeed, the shadow of a justification for the proposed restriction. Questions must always be more or less vexatious. To say that the questions were vexatious was to object to them, because they were questions. To say that

the questions put were too many was to ignore the obvious circumstances of the situation. The Councils did not meet as often as might be expected—the opportunities for asking questions were limited, and they necessarily accumulated in the hands of members.

It is, indeed, the unanimous testimony of officials and non-officials that the right has been exercised in a manner that is creditable to the members and conducive to the public interests. The writer on Indian affairs in the *Times*, a discriminating judge in these matters, thus observes :—

"The practical operation of the system indicates that the Viceregal forecast of its working, from Lord Ripon onwards, was the correct one. The questions asked in the Supreme and Provincial Legislature during the past two years cover the whole area of Indian administration and of the economic interests of the people. With scarcely an exception, they have tended to a better understanding between the rulers and the ruled ; and in important instances they have furnished a valuable opportunity of placing the actual facts before the public."

With regard to the exercise of the right in the Bengal Council, the same writer thus bears equally satisfactory testimony :—

"In a forward province like Bengal, with Calcutta as its captial, and a native Press extremely active if not always accurately informed, the practice of interpellation has proved even more useful. The Bengal Government has to deal with the chronic unrest arising out of the desire of the educated classes to enjoy an ever-increasing share of the higher posts of the Administration. The present Governor of Bengal has recognized the necessity of dealing with such aspirations in a spirit of fairness, and, indeed, of generosity. Sir Charles Elliott has opened up the higher offices of his Government to natives of India to an extent never dreamt of by his predecessors. 'It is only the confidence which Englishmen in India have in the practical sagacity and sound commonsense of Sir Charles Elliot as an experienced administrator,' writes the leading Calcutta journal, 'that induces them to refrain from regarding with suspicion the liberal concessions which he has inaugurated, concessions which, as we have said, no other Government up to the present time has ventured to imitate.' But a section of the Bengali Press by a curious misapprehension demands that all offices for which the Public Service Commission declared natives to be eligible shall forthwith be filled by a native, irrespective of the fact that there may be many European officers better qualified for the individual post. It is, of course, unsuitable for a Government to enter into newspaper controversies, and a misconception of this character becomes a source of widespread political disquiet in Bengal. Fortunately a distinguished Hindu member of the Bengal Council put a question which embodied the general misapprehension and enabled the Government to correct it."

From non-official let us pass on to official testimony and the testimony which I am going to quote is that of no less exalted an official than Sir Charles Elliott. The late Lieutenant-Governor was a thorough-going official—some would prefer to call him a typical bureaucrat. But at any rate he was no mean judge of the matter. This was what he said from his place as President of the Bengal Legislative Council :—

"I think you will agree with me that the results have not altogether met the anticipations which we formed. Somehow or other—it is difficult to say how—a sort of idea has grown up in the public mind that an interpellation must necessarily be hostile, and that an Hon'ble member who puts an interpellation may be presumed to have a desire to heckle the Government or to expose its shortcomings in some way or another. I think it is most unfortunate that such a feeling should have grown up. It has been due to criticisms which

have been passed on the style of questions put not so much in this Council, as in the Councils of other provinces, and I think in many cases these criticisms, whether applied to other provinces or applied to this Province have not been altogether reasonable or sympathetic. I certainly feel that I have nothing very much to complain of as regards the spirit with which interpellations have been put here, but I think that we might put interpellations upon a better footing if it were thoroughly understood that the Government desire to deal with all the members of this Council as its trusted Councillors whom it wishes to associate with itself in its policy, and to whom it wishes to impart the information which it possesses."

Having regard to the testimony of the high authorities I have quoted, might we not ask for the removal of those restrictions which seem to me to defeat the purposes of a beneficent legislation. In the House of Commons "sometimes when an answer has been given, further questions are addressed to the Minister on the same subject," apparently with a view to offer an explanation or remove a misconception. In the House of lords greater latitude is allowed in putting questions(Erskine May, "Parliamentary Practice," page 329). In the House of Lords when a question is put, the member putting it may make a speech in explanation of the question, and by way of preface to it. One of the objects which the Government had in view in conferring the right of interpellation was to afford opportunities for clearing up misconceptions with regard to the measures of Government and the conduct of officials. Looking at the matter from this standpoint, it seems to me that the object which the Government had in view would be best served by adopting the practice of the House of Commons—a practice which has been sanctioned by the wisdom of ages.

Under the Indian Councils Amended Act of 1892 not only have the Councils been partially reconstituted, but their functions have been enlarged—the discussion of the Budget has been allowed, whether it is proposed to levy any new tax or not. This right, however, is to be exercised subject to an important reservation. Members may discuss the Budget—may make any observations they please—but they cannot move any Resolution in respect of any item in the Budget or divide the Council thereupon. This seems to me to be altogether a needless restriction, having regard to the fact that the Government has a standing majority in the Councils. If the non-official members were united to a man they could not carry any Resolution, if the Government was firmly resolved to oppose it. I venture to submit that if there is one class of questions more than another in respect of which the representatives of the people should exercise any control, it is financial questions. No taxation without representation is the theory of modern civilised Government. We do not ask the Government to embody this principle in the administration of the country. We know that politics is a practical art, and it cannot deal with principles in the abstract. Every political principle must be tested by reference to the actual circumstances under which it is sought to apply it; but when, as in this case, the acceptance of our recommendation can lead to no practical inconvenience but on the contrary is calculated still further to extend the immediate objects of the Indian Councils Act of 1892, and to add to the popularity

of the administration, we feel that we stand on sure ground, and that we may appeal with confidence to the Government to adopt it. Englishmen are our teachers. At their feet we have learnt those constitutional principles which have moulded the Governments of civilized worlds, and which we hope will one day be incorporated in the Government of this country. If there is one thing more than another which their constitutional history impresses upon the mind of the reader, it is this: the zealous solicitude which the English people show at every stage of their history to ensure to their representatives, and to them alone, the full and absolute control over the finances of the country. A money Bill becomes law when it has passed the House of Commons. The House of Lords has no sort of jurisdiction over it. I find that in the Ceylon Legislative Council there is no bar to a member moving any Resolution on a financial question, provided the previous assent of the Governor has been obtained thereto. A beginning might, indeed, be made upon these lines. If the Government hesitates to grant to our representatives in Council the right of moving Resolutions on the Budget without some reservation, the concession may be made subject to the restriction to which I have referred, and which obtains in the Ceylon Legislative Council.

The question of the Budget naturally leads me to consider how our laws are made. A private member may, indeed, introduce a Bill subject to leave being granted by Government. Practically, however, the work of legislation is left in the hands of the Government. It must be so, in this as in all other countries. So far as the local Councils are concerned, if it is proposed to introduce a Bill it is prepared by the local Government in the Legislative Department. It is then submitted to the Government of India, and the sanction of the Government having been obtained, it is introduced into the Council. In the Governor-General's Council before a Bill is introduced it is submitted for the sanction of the Secretary of State. The result is that, whether a Bill is introduced into a local Legislative Council with the assent of the Government of India, or into the Supreme Legislative Council with the assent of the Secretary of State, the sanction of superior authority in each case operates in the nature of a mandate upon the somewhat susceptible minds of official members. They vote in a solid phalanx. The amendments of non-official members have absolutely no chance. There is the mandate, express or implied. The bill must be passed as assented to by the Government of India or the Secretary of State. Legislation under these circumstances becomes a foregone conclusion—the debate a mere formal ceremony—some people will call it a farce. (*Hear, hear.*)

But the theory of a mandate was never so broadly stated as it was last year by His Excellency the Viceroy and some of his official colleagues, on the occasion of the debate on the Excise Bill. Sir Henry Brackenbury, the Military member, observed with the bluntness of a soldier, that in the matter of voting "they were bound to obey orders given by proper and constituted authority." His Excellency the Viceroy would not accord to members absolute freedom "to speak and vote in the Council for the measure they think best." The right must be exercised

subject to an important qualification—they must recognise the responsibility under which they exercised their rights in the Council. His Excellency went on to observe that even Members of Parliament are not free to act as they please, but are distinctly subject to the mandate of their constituents. This exposition of the theory of a mandate from higher authority, to vote not in accordance with the dictates of one's own conscience, but rather in obedience to superior authority, elicited a strong protest in Council from Sir Griffith Evans, Mr. Pherozeshah Mehta and others, and I am sure you, too, will record your protest against a principle which if accepted would be fatal to the independence of non-official Members of Council. Whether or not Members of Parliament act under any mandate received from their constituents is a matter which we need not discuss here. Members of Parliament are well able to take care of themselves and their consciences. The mandate theory is an old theory—it does not appear before us even in a new garb. After the lapse of a century, it is presented to us in the nakedness of its original simplicity. It formed the subject of an emphatic protest from Edmund Burke, one of the greatest names in English politics. His colleague in the representation of Bristol had raised the question, and Burke replied in a letter which has found a permanent place in the political literature of England. I will read an extract from his letter to the Electors of Bristol, which might fittingly be laid before those who take a different view of the subject :—

"*Authoritative* instructions, *mandates* issued, which the member is bound blindly and implicitly to obey, to vote, and to argue for, though contrary to the clearest conviction of his judgment and conscience—these are things utterly unknown to the laws of the land, and which arise from a fundamental mistake of the whole order and tenor of our constitution."

Yet Burke was a Conservative. He called himself a Whig—but he was truly a Conservative statesman—he was a Heaven-appointed Conservative— one made so by the hand of Nature. His sympathies and leanings were all distinctly towards the Conservative side of questions. In these days he would have taken his place in the front-rank of Conservative leaders, only his conservatism was not prompted by self-interest ; it was tempered by philosophy and a love of country, rare among professional politicians. Burke was the founder of modern conservative philosophy. Confronted with the destructive forces of the French Revolution, his whole life was passed in reconciling the conflicting elements of order and progress. Lord Elgin is a Radical and a Home Ruler. It would almost seem that in this matter the Conservatism of the last century was really more sound and progressive than the Liberalism of the present. It is remarkable that only a year before this exposition of the mandate theory, a very different exposition had been heard of the same theory in the Council Chamber of the Bengal Legislative Council. It was on the eve of the enlargement of the Council. Popular constituencies were about to be formed. Mandates might be issued by these constituencies upon their representatives. To be forewarned is to be forearmed. Sir Charles Elliott took time by the forelock, as he always did when he was in office, and warned would-be-representatives against the contingency of mandates being issued by their

constituents. Thus he observed from his place in the Bengal Council on the 25th February, 1893 :—

"We are now on the eve of an important reconstruction of this Council the details of which are at present unknown. But we are aware that there will be a considerable extension and expansion of the principle of representation, and I think it very important that it should be understood to what extent and of what character the representation ought to be. I do not venture to forecast what orders we may receive from the Secretary of State or from the Government of India on this subject, but I wish most emphatically to record my agreement with what has fallen from the Advocate-General, that, however much a Member of this Council may be a representative of any Corporation, or of any interest, or of any body or Association existing in these Provinces, he will, on his appointment as a Member of this Council, act according to his lights and according to his conscience. His position ought not to be that of a delegate, and he ought not to be called upon to record his vote in accordance with the views of constituents whom he represents, unless he heartily and personally agrees with them."

Whose authority are we to accept, that of the Viceroy or his late Lieutenant? It is seldom that we find Sir Charles Elliott on the popular side. When he is with us, we may be quite sure that we have exceptionally good reasons for thinking that we are in the right.

Somehow or other, Secretaries of State, and before them the Board of Control, have been wedded to this mandate theory. They have claimed this right from time to time. The Duke of Argyle in a Despatch, dated the 24th November 1870, maintained that "the Government of India were mere executive officers of the Home Government who had the ultimate power of requiring the Governor-General to introduce a measure and of requiring also all the official Members of the Council to vote for it." The theory has, however, been always strenuously resisted by the independent Members of Council, and by none more strenuously than by Sir Barnes Peacock, perhaps the greatest English lawyer who ever set foot on Indian soil. He said : "He had always understood and he still held, that the office of a Member of Council was a high and honourable one ; but if he believed that the constitution of this Council was such that its members were bound to legislate in any manner that either the Board of Control or the Honourable Court of Directors might order, he should say that instead of being a high and honourable office, it was one which no man who had a regard for his own honour and independence could consent to hold ; for his own part he would state freely and without hesitation that he would rather resign his office than hold it on that tenure......He believed that the trust and duty committed to every member of the Legislative Council was to act according to his own judgment and conscience."

If your Legislative Councils are an important matter for your consideration, your finances form the back-bone of your administration. Tell me, said John Bright in substance, in one of his speeches, what the financial condition of a country is, and I will tell you all about its Government and the condition of its people. The financial test is the most crucial. Judged by it our position is truly deplorable. It is no exaggeration to say that the financial position of India is one of ever-recurring deficit, and of ever-increasing debt. I should be sorry to say one word which

would convey to the mind of any one an exaggerated notion of the difficulties by which the Government of India is surrounded. Let there be "Naught extenuate or aught set down in malice." But I think I am strictly within the limits of truth when I say that, so far as our financial position is concerned, debt and deficit represent the order of the day. Let me ask you to follow me as I rapidly glance over a few facts and figures in connection with the financial history of the sixty years from 1834 to 1894. During this period you have had 34 years of deficit amounting in round numbers to 83 crores of rupees, and 26 years of surplus amounting to 42 crores of rupees in round numbers, with the net result that you have a net deficit of about 41 crores of rupees, which makes an average of deficits of something over sixty-five lakhs of rupees per year. Our debt kept pace with our deficit. They are twin sisters which march apace. It must be so in the nature of things. An ever increasing deficit must produce an ever-accumulating debt. During the same period the Public Debt increased from 26 crores to 210 crores; and 42 crores of this amount were incurred within the last ten years. If we are not bankrupts, at any rate, we are on the high road to it. If an ordinary individual found that his expenditure was steadily increasing, that his income was not increasing in the same proportion, that his resources were strained to the utmost, and that his debt was fast accumulating, he would feel that he was perilously near bankruptcy. But I suppose Governments are not like ordinary mortals. They do not participate in the common feelings and the common failings of our ordinary human nature—and hence the optimism of our rulers.

What is it that has brought the country to its present deplorable financial position? The answer must be that it is in the main the aggressive military policy of the Government. The depreciated rupee has much to answer for; it is responsible for many sins of omission and commission, but it is not wholly nor even mainly chargeable with the present financial embarrassments of the Government. Sir Auckland Colvin in a recent article in the *Nineteenth Century* observes that the increase of Indian expenditure from 1883-84 to 1892-93, amounting to about 11 crores of rupees, was due to three causes, and he regards the Military charges as the first and the foremost of these (*vide* page 873, *The Nineteenth Century* for November). In the course of the same article he observes:—"There can be no improvement in Indian finances so long as Indian revenues are depleted by the claims of frontier extension, or exposed to the risk and requirements of war." Fall in the exchange and the abnormal activity in the State construction of railways on a gold basis, when the exchange value of silver is rapidly falling, are, in the opinion of Sir Auckland Colvin, the other and less effective causes of this increased expenditure. Sir William Harcourt in the course of a recent debate on Chitral held that the additional military charges were among the elements which have disorganised Indian finance. Let me quote his words:—

"The question of the ability of India to bear a burden of this character is a very serious question. We all know, with reference to the expedition to Afganistan hat there was a large addition made some years ago to the Indian Army, and

that addition to the Army was among the elements which have led to the financial difficulties of India."

The British Committee of the National Congress took substantially the same view of the matter. In a Note which they circulated they held that it was not exchange so much as the increase in Civil and Military expenditure which was responsible for the financial difficulties of the Government of India. Sir James Westland accused the Committee of having committed "a gigantic blunder." The Committee came back to the attack and showed that their mistake was not a huge blunder, and that it was due to the system of accounts sanctioned by the authority of the Indian Finance Department, over which Sir James Westland presided. They further pointed out that "the expenditure on the Civil and Military Services exhibits the large increase of Rs. 8,54,346 apart from any increase in exchange."

It is not then exchange—it is not some economic monster over which the Government of India has no control and which cannot be disposed of by the closing of the Mints—that is responsible for the present deplorable condition of Indian finance. It is in the main the Military policy pursued by the Government which has brought us to our present position. The Military charges have steadily increased. At the time of the Indian Mutiny with an army of 240,000 men, the Military expenditure of the country came up to 11 crores of rupees. In 1864 with a reduced army the expenditure was 14 crores of rupees. In the meantime the amalgamation scheme between the Indian Government and the War Office had been carried out—that contract had been entered into, which, in the felicitous language of the late Mr. Fawcett, was a contract between a dwarf and a giant, in which of course the dwarf went to the wall. In 1884, with an army of 189,000 men the expenditure came up to 17 crores of rupees; in 1895-96 it is 20 crores of rupees exclusive of exchange. In March 1885, Sir Auckland Colvin, speaking from his place as Finance Minister, estimated the net cost of the Army (exclusive of exchange) at 150,000,000 of rupees. This amount he considered to be about the normal expenditure in India and in England. If we add another crore of rupees (excluding exchange) for Military works, not taking into account special defence works, the net Military expenditure may be fixed at 16 crores of rupees. Now within the last 20 years this normal expenditure has been exceeded by more than 50 crores of rupees. Let me give you the rough details:

	Rx.
Afghan War	11,500,000
Annexation of Upper Burma	4,000,000
Increase in Army (9 full years)	13,500,000
Expeditions, Increased Expenditure, Occupation of Upper Burma, etc.	22,800,000
	Rx. 51,800,000

This policy, so disastrous to the financial interests of India, is being followed by our rulers with unabated zeal; and the most recent illustration of it is afforded

by the annexation of Chitral. The expedition to Chitral was condemned by the Indian Press with singular unanimity. But whatever justification there might have been for the expedition, there is absolutely none for the permanent occupation of the country. In the proclamation issued by the Government there was a distinct promise that when the object of the expedition had been attained, the forces would be withdrawn. I quote the exact words of the Proclamation :—

"The sole object of the Government of India is to put an end to the present, and to prevent any future, unlawful aggression on Chitral territory ; and as soon as the object has been attained the forces will be withdrawn."

Thus was a solemn declaration made before all India that after the object of the expedition had been attained, which was the relief of the beleaguered garrison and the protection of Chitral against any present and future troubles, the army would be withdrawn. I must express my unqualified surprise that with this declaration before it, to the faithful observance of which the Honour of the Government was pledged, the Government of India with Lord Elgin at its head, should have unanimously recommended the occupation of the country. I desire to place the moral consideration in the forefront; (*Cheers*) that which is morally indefensible cannot be politically expedient. (*Hear, hear.*) Politics divorced from morality is no politics at all ; (*Cheers*) it is political jugglery of the worst description. It is not for one moment to be supposed that the semi-civilized races, who have thus been treated, whose forberance and neutrality was secured by a promise made to be broken, are insensible to the binding character of a moral obligation. (*Hear, hear.*) They will feel the wrong and the insult ; they will brood over the injustice, which, in the words of Carlyle, never fails to "revenge itself with compound interest." (*Hear, hear.*) What explanation has the Government of India to offer in support of its policy? I have not heard of any, except the halting and lame defence that was put forward by the Prime Minister from his place in Parliament. The annexation was sought to be justified on grounds of moral, if not of physical, strategy. It was said that if the troops were withdrawn and the country was abandoned, it would involve loss of prestige and produce a detrimental effect upon the minds of the tribes. It seems to me, with all deference, that the Prime Minister's moral strategy is very much wide of the mark. Moral strategy inconsistent with moral principles is a very poor sort of strategy. (*Hear, hear.*) If the tribes are human beings—I suppose they are—(*Laughter*) with human instincts and feelings this breach of a solemn promise will have a disastrous effect upon their minds. It will have a far more detrimental effect than what might be supposed to be produced by the alleged loss of prestige,consequent upon the withdrawal of the troops. It will alienate their syampathies and convert them into discontented allies or open foes. If this be one of the objects which is sought to be attained by the new code of moral strategy, I have nothing to say to it.

But what about the financial aspect of the question. That is the consideration which presses most upon us. From this point of view its gravity cannot be overestimated. When the expedition started last summer, it was stated, confidently

stated, that 15 lakhs of rupees would suffice to cover all expenses. Wise men shook their heads. But all doubts and misgivings gave way for the time at least, before the positive assurances of the Government and its organs in the Press. Have these confident predictions been fulfilled? How many fifteen lakhs of rupees have been spent upon the expedition, it is difficult to say; but this ludicrously low estimate serves to indicate the want of foresight which is sometimes displayed by the Financial Department in dealing with estimates. In India the public memory is notoriously short; but we have not yet quite forgotten the story of the missing four crores which had disappeared amid the mountain-passes of Afghanistan, and which the Financial Department was at its wit's end to discover. The estimate was fixed at 15 lakhs of rupees, but the expedition, it is believed, has cost nearly two crores of rupees; and the further question occurs—will not the occupation of Chitral involve an addition to the Indian Army and to the already excessive Military expenditure of the empire? Mr. Balfour in the course of the discussion which took place in the House of Commons in September last, gave the assurance that there would be "no addition to the Indian Army." The Indian Government inform us categorically," he went on to observe, "that the existing body of troops in India would suffice to meet every necessity. The garrison force in Gilgit will be diminished; there will be re-distribution of troops, but no addition will be required." The obvious retort to which the explanation is liable is that if Chitral could be occupied without any addition to the forces, the Indian Government had at its disposal an overgrown army in excess of the requirements of the country. However that may be, can we rely upon this assurance? Can we rely upon the ever-shifting phases of Central Asian politics? We will not say that the Government will deliberately depart from an assurance thus solemnly given, but the Government may be driven into a position, by reason of the occupation of Chitral, which may compel the Government to add to the Army and the military expenditure of the Empire. It is impossible to say what may or may not happen in Central Asian politics. A forward movement on the frontier involves the Government in indefinite responsibilities which it is impossible to foresee and calculate upon with confidence. Thus observed Lord Lawrence many many years ago:—

"We foresee no limits to the expenditure which such a move (a forward move) might require; and we protest against the necessity of having to impose additional taxation on the people of India, who are unwilling, as it is, to bear such pressure for measures which they can both understand and appreciate....our true policy, our strongest security will be found to be in the contentment, if not in the attachment, of the masses .. in husbanding our finances and consolidating and multiplying our resources."

Times without number have we in Congress assembled, under the guidance of my esteemed friend, Mr. Wacha, whose knowledge of details is only surpassed by his zeal for the public good, protested against the extravagant military expenditure of the Government. The Government is in quest of a scientific frontier, by which

we understand a frontier which is better capable of being defended against a foreign invader than a frontier which is not scientific. But, as Colonel Hanna has pointed out in a little book on frontier policy which I would like to recommend to you, that which is scientific is fixed and definite. What is scientific to-day cannot be unscientific to-morrow. A scientific frontier cannot constantly be receding in the distance like the *ignis fatuus*, as you advance towards it. Let me tell the Government of India, in your name, that the true scientific frontier against Russian invasion does not lie in some remote inaccessible mountain which has yet to be discovered, nor is it to be found in the House of Commons as some one said; but it lies deep in the grateful hearts of a loyal and contented people. If India is loyal and grateful, and is united by a common sentiment of devotion to British rule, resolved to die in its defence, India can raise a barrier which will defy the efforts of the most powerful foreign invader who yet has desecrated our territories. Where have you heard of a foreign invader being triumphant against the efforts of a united people, and of a people too like ourselves, as countless as the stars of heaven, and as multitudinous as the sands of the sea. I have heard of this Russian invasion since the days of my childhood. The Russians have not come. They never will come; and if they do come, and if India is loyal and united, then they will find behind the serried ranks of one of the finest armies in the world the multitudinous races and peoples of India united as one man ready to die for the Sovereign and in the defence of their hearths and homes. But I am bound to add that the Government is alienating the sympathies of the people by wasting their resources upon these frontier wars. The commonest domestic improvements are starved, the most urgent domestic reforms are postponed through want of funds. But when it comes to a question of granting a subsidy to some frontier Chief, or embarking upon some frontier expedition, or entertaining the son of a Prince who has been useful to us in frontier politics, then our Government is as rich as the richest Government in the world.

But we are in excellent company in condemning the forward policy which is now in the ascendant in the Councils of the Government. Some of the most distinguished statesmen who have adorned the annals of modern Indian history, one of them intimately acquainted with frontier affairs, to whose foresight the salvation of the Empire was due at a critical time, have repeatedly warned the Government to confine their attention to within their own dominions, and to devote themselves to the improvement of the condition of the people. This was what Lord Lawrence wrote:—"Taking every view, then, of this great question—the progress of Russia in Central Asia, the effect it will, in course of time, have upon India, the arrangements which we should have to make to meet it—I am firmly of opinion that our proper course is not to advance our troops beyond our present border, nor to send English Officers into the different States of Central Asia, but to put our own house in order by giving the people of India the best government in our power, by conciliating, as far as practicable, all classes, and by consolidating our resources."

Lord Lawrence's advice was "to put our house in order by giving the people of India, the best form of Government in our power" "and by conciliating all classes." The same views, if not expressed in the same words, were shared by a host of other eminent statesmen and soldiers, among whom I may mention the names of Lord Canning, Lord Mayo, Lord Northbrook, Sir Henry Norman, Sir Henry Durand, Sir William Muir, and last though not least, Sir William Mansfield, afterwards Lord Sandhurst, the father of your excellent Governor.

Are these ideas to be regarded as old-fashioned and antiquated? Have circumstances so changed as to call for a complete change, and not only a change but an absolute reversal of the policy of masterly inactivity associated with the honoured name of Lord Lawrence? I do not think so. The circumstances connected with the border politics have perhaps undergone some change, but not such as to require the adoption of a spirited frontier policy, leading to a sensible addition to the Indian Army and to numerous petty little wars which have completely disorganised our finances. The Simla Army Commission which submitted its Report in 1884 recognized this change, but nevertheless did not recommend any addition to the Indian Army. The Commission considered the Army, such as it then was, sufficient for all purposes of offensive and defensive operations. What is it, then, that has brought about this charge—this radical and fundamental change in the policy of our rulers? It was the Penjdeh incident which upset the equanimity of the Government, and plunged the country into an expensive military programme, which has brought the Indian Government to the verge of bankruptcy. It was immediately followed by the addition of thirty thousand men to the Army. As Sir Auckland Colvin has observed, what were our rulers to do with such a fine and splendidly organised Army if they did not occasionally indulge in the luxury of a frontier expedition, at the expense of the Indian tax-payer? In all conscience the temptation is great; and the late Sir William Mansfield, afterwards Lord Sandhurst, went so far as to observe that the real cause of the agitation set on foot in his time for an aggressive policy "was what might be styled Brevet Mania or K. C. B. Mania rather than Russophobia."

In dealing with the question of Indian Finance the Home Charges loom largely in view. They have gone on steadily increasing. In ten years they have risen over 30 per cent. In 1882 they were Rs. 17,366,000. In 1892 they were Rs. 22,911,000. They have been the subject of adverse comment by the successive Viceroy. Charges are thrown upon us which should be borne by the Home Treasury, or in respect of which there should be an adjustment between the Home and the Indian Treasuries. Charges are thrown upon us, which, or charges similar to which, in the case of the free and independent Colonies, are borne by the Home Government. We paid £ 500,000 for the construction of the India Office in London. The Home Government paid £ 100,000 for the construction of the Colonial Office in London. Can anybody tell me why the Colonial Office cost £ 100,000 in the construction, and the India Office £ 500,000? Did it make any difference that the one was paid for out of our money

and the other out of the money of the English tax-payer, who can look after his purse and can control the public expenditure? But let us proceed. We pay all the charges of the India Office in London amounting to £ 230,000 a year. The Home Government pays £ 41,000 for the Colonial Office in London. We pay £ 12,500 a year for the maintenance of the Chinese Legation, and £ 7,000 a year for the Persian Legation. The cost of the Residency in Turkish Arabia and of the Consulate in Bagdad, amounting to Rs. 1,72,360, is entirely paid from the Indian revenues, as if England in her imperial relations was in no way interested in their maintenance. Is not Bagdad one of the head-quarters of Central Asian politics—the focus of intrigue in that part of the world? And is not England interested in the maintenance of the Consulate there?

The economic aspect of this question is not to be overlooked. England does not levy any direct tribute upon India. But these Home Charges operate in the nature of a tribute. As Sir George Wingate very properly observed many many years ago in connection with these Home Charges:—"The taxes spent in the country from which they are raised are totally different in their effect from taxes raised in one country and spent in another. . . . In this case, they constitute no mere transfer of one portion of the national income from one set of citizens to another, but are an absolute loss and extinction of the whole amount drawn from the taxed country."

The Home Charges constitute a serious drain, and add to the ever-increasing poverty of the country. But it is no use repeating the old complaint. We must be prepared to formulate definite proposals in this connection for the consideration of Government. I cordially endorse the view which has been put forward by a writer in the columns of *India*, to the effect that the Home Government should bear a portion of the Home Charges. I trust the Royal Commission now enquiring into Indian Expenditure will see its way to make a recommendation to that effect. This would be nothing but fair and just, and what is due to the interests of India.

We have fought the wars of England in the past with our blood and treasure. In the Abyssinian Expedition, it was we who fought and bled; it was the Indian Government which spent its treasure and sacrificed the lives of its brave soldiers. It was your Bombay troops who, in the somewhat pompous language of Mr. Benjamin Disraeli, "planted the standard of St. George on the heights of Rasselas." In the Afghan wars in Lord Lytton's time India bore the entire expense, save and except a sum of five millions sterling, contributed by Mr. Gladstone's Government.

In Central Asian Policy, a policy in which India alone is interested? Does it not affect the Imperial relations of England as a great Asiatic, and even as a great European, power? It is true we are interested—largely interested—but we are not solely and exclusively interested. Why, then, should we alone be required to pay towards the promotion of schemes and projects, of wars and negotiations, of commissions and entertainments to Royal Princes which are due to the requirements of Imperial policy? When many years ago, I think it was in the sixties, the Sultan of Turkey was entertained at our expense, the Government stated in reply to a

question that the money had been paid out of the Indian Treasury, as it was believed that the entertainment would be gratifying to the Mahomedan subjects of Her Majesty. Is it proposed to justify on the same principle the entire burden of the Nasarulla entertainment being thrown on the Indian Exchequer? No explanation has been given on this score, though Sir William Wedderburn pressed hard to bring about a division of the expenditure between the two countries. Sirdar Nasarulla went to England as the guest of the English people—and at the invitation of the British Government. If there was any policy underlying this personal matter, it was one solely prompted by the exigencies of England's imperial position. If so, was it just and generous for a great and rich Government like that of England to saddle a poverty-stricken country like India with the entire cost of the entertainment? It is a small matter. But if in a paltry affair like this, there is an utter absence of the spirit of fairness and of a desire to do strict justice in dealing with the finances of an unrepresented dependency, what may we not expect in matters of greater moment? (*Cheers*).

The apportionment of the Home Charges between England and India would not only be just, but is desirable from another point of view. At the present moment nobody seems to be responsible for Indian finance. In the felicitous language of the late Mr. George Yule, whose memory this Congress holds in high honour, India was a trust committed by Providence to the care of Parliament. Parliament has thrown the trust back upon Providence. In the Indian Legislative Council the debate on the Budget is more or less academic in its character. The members cannot move any resolution in respect of it. In Parliament the Indian Budget is introduced at the fag-end of the Session, and is discussed before empty benches. No English Minister would dare to deal with the English Budget in this way; but if the English Treasury made a contribution to the Home Charges, we may be quite sure the British tax-payer would insist upon a scrutiny as to how the money was spent, and the British member of Parliament, now usually so apathetic with regard to Indian affairs, would be responsive to the call of his constituents. The real and genuine, and not the mere nominal, control of the English Parliament would thus be secured. This would be an advantage worth having, for we have unstinted confidence in the justice and generosity of the British people and their representatives in Parliament.

The poverty of the masses of our countrymen has been the theme of endless discussion here and elsewhere. We know what the views of Mr. Dadabhai Naoroji are. He holds that the average income per head of the population in India is Rs. 20, against Lord Cromer's estimate of Rs. 27 a year. Whether it is Rs. 20 or Rs. 27 per head makes no difference. It is striking evidence of the deplorable poverty of the masses of our population. If you compare the economic condition of the masses of our people with that of more fortunately situated countries in Europe, this truth forces itself upon our attention with painful impressiveness. Lord Cromer is my authority. Lord Cromer, then Sir Evelyn Baring, gave some figures in 1882 which throw a lurid light upon the economic condition of our

people. The average income of the population per head in Great Britain was estimated by him at £ 33 a year ; in France it was £ 23 ; in Turkey, which is the poorest country in Europe, it was 4£. Mulhal gives the income per head of the Russian population at £ 9. Upon this income of 33£ the English tax-payer pays a tax of £2-12 per head ; the Indian tax-payer upon his income of Rs. 20 or Rs. 27 a year, pays a tax of 2*s*. 6*d*. per head. The English tax-payer thus pays a tax of 7 per cent. upon his income of £ 33, while the Indian tax-payer pays a tax of 5 per cent. upon his income of Rs. 27. It will be readily admitted that five per cent. upon an income of Rs. 27 is a much more serious matter—involves a much heavier sacrifice—than 7 per cent, upon an income of £ 33. I ask you to bear in mind one little consideration. The average calculation is made by dividing the whole income of the community, whatever it may be, among the heads of population. But it is, after all, an average. There must be a large number whose income is below the average, as there must be a large number whose income is above it. I ask you for one moment to consider what must be the condition in life of that large number of people whose income is below Rs. 27 a year?

It is no wonder, then, that 40 millions of our people live upon one meal a day, as stated by Sir William Hunter, or that we have those periodical famines which decimate thousands and hundreds of thousands of our population. Cuvier has remarked that famines are impossible in this age. So they are in European countries, but not in this hapless land of ours, which a great orator in the last century described as "the garden of Asia, the granary of the East." We must all note with thankfulness that an influential journal like the *Pioneer*, supposed to be the exponent of official opinion, takes the popular view of the matter. That journal freely admits:—"That the masses in India are poor, very poor ; that our administration is an expensive one ; that money is often wasted in enterprises like the Chitral imbroglio, and that in various directions, without administrative injury, economy and retrenchment might be enforced."

I am glad to find that the Salvation Army have had their attention prominently called to the poverty-stricken condition of our masses. With an all-comprehensive philanthropy which does honour to their Christianity they have not forgotten the Indian poor. Their scheme for the reclamation of the submerged tenth will include our submerged fifth. Their scheme for Indian peasant-settlements is well worth consideration ; and, whatever we may think of its details, our sympathies must go forth on behalf of a project, so noble, so generous, so full of the spirit of true Christian charity.

Upon this miserable income of Rs. 27 a year, the native of India has to pay a tax of 5 per cent., while the Englishman with an average annual income of £ 33, pays only a tax of 7½ per cent. The furthest limits of taxation have, indeed, been reached. The import duties on cotton goods which had been abolished in Lord Ripon's time had to be re-imposed to meet the exigencies of an impecunious Government. This was an extreme step which no Government anxious to secure the votes of Lancashire would take except under a sense of supreme and imperious necessity. That the

duties should have been re-imposed is evidence of the financial crisis to which the country has been reduced. The duties are not meant to be protective; they never were protective in their character. They were levied for revenue purposes; they are now levied for revenue. There is not a more earnest advocate of Free Trade than Mr. Gladstone. He was a member of the Government of Sir Robert Peel when the principles of Free Trade were for the first time recognised by an English Government in the administrative measures of the country. Mr. Gladstone strongly opposed the partial repeal of these duties in Lord Lytton's time, on the ground that if they militated against the principles of Free Trade, the financial condition of the Government was an essential element in the consideration. From his place in Parliament he thus denounced the repeal of the duties :—

"What an invidious, almost odious, picture of inequality we exhibit to the millions of India. The Free Trade doctrines that we hold so dear, that we apply them against the feelings of the Indian people in their utmost rigour and without a grain of mercy, disappear in a moment when it is a question of dealing with those whose interest and opinions we cannot lightly tamper with, namely, the free colonists of the Empire. The Governor-General, says he, cannot see that financial difficulty can in any way be pleaded as a reason against what he calls fiscal reform. If that be a true principle of Government, it has been discovered for the first time by the present Viceroy. There has not been a Free Trade Government in this or any country which has not freely admitted that the state of the revenue is an essential element in the consideration of the application even of the best principle of Free Trade."

I am free to admit there is some protection involved in allowing Indian yarn only to be taxed above 20 *s* count, and imposing a duty upon all descriptions of cloth and yarn imported from the United Kingdom. But the measure of this protection is infinitesimal when you bear in mind that the duty on cloth and yarn imported of 20*s* count and under, according to the estimate of Mr. O'Conor, is about four lakhs out of a total of about a crore and-a-half. Manchester imports but little of these coarser fabrics; there is little or no competition here; nobody perhaps would object if these four lakhs of rupees were abandoned by exempting from duty all imported yarn and cloth of 20 *s* count and under. For myself I would prefer a remission of the salt duties to this remission of the import duties.

But Manchester has another grievance. While only Indian yarns of the finer kind are taxed, all cotton fabrics of the finer sort imported from England are taxed. The Government charges more upon the manufactured goods than upon the yarns. To that extent, the finer cloths which are imported are handicaped against Indian goods of the same class. To that extent there is protection. This may be easily remedied by fixing a lower duty upon these manufactured goods imported from England, say a duty of four per cent. instead of five per cent.

What the ultimate fate of these duties will be, it is difficult to say. Manchester is vigorously agitating for their repeal. The present Secretary of State, Lord George Hamilton, had, indeed, strongly denounced the imposition of these duties from his

place in Parliament, while he was a member of the Opposition. The supporters of the duties were politely told by his Lordship that they were so many "shrieking units" of the Indian community who chiefly lived in the metropolitan towns of Calcutta, Madras, and Bombay—I am quoting from memory, I cannot be sure whether Poona was included—and who had learnt the methods of Western agitation, but that their opinion was in no way to be confounded with the opinion of the great body of the people. By a strange irony of fate his Lordship has apparently joined hands with "the shrieking units," whom he had not long ago so vigorously denounced. It is very evident from his recent utterances that, while, as he tells us, he firmly adheres to his former views, he does not see his way to gratify the wishes of Lancashire. He is waiting for the Despatches of the Government of India on the subject. The elections are over. There is a long time yet to think of the next elections, and in the meantime many things may happen. If Manchester has a grievance, and there can be no doubt that she feels she has a grievance, let her agitate for financial justice to India, and she will command the sympathies of educated India.

From one point of view Manchester has, indeed, a grievance. The duties are levied, and yet Exchange Compensation Allowance is granted to the European officials of the Government. Practically the proceeds of the duties are paid as compensation allowance. The proceeds of the duties come up to about a crore and a-half a year. The disbursements under Exchange Compensation Allowance come up to about the same sum. Abolish the Exchange Compensation Allowance, and you need not impose the duties. As between the two I would rather abolish the duties than grant Exchange Compensation Allowance. If the allowance was made upon actual remittances sent to England, or if it was granted only to such officials as had joined the service before the rapid fall in the rupee had set in, there might be some show of a justification. As it is, it constitutes an invidious and irritating distinction between the European and the non-European officials of the Government. According to the most recent explanation given by Lord George Hamilton, the object of the Exchange Compensation Allowance is to afford European servants of the Government the opportunity of making remittances Home and providing themselves with English-made articles. Whether they do so or not is quite another matter.

Exchange Compensation Allowance seems to me to be useless for the purpose for which it is granted. It is not a sufficient inducement to the senior officers to continue after their term of service has been completed; while the popularity of the Indian Civil Service among the educated youth in England, notwithstanding the rapid fall in the Exchange, may be judged from the fact that three English candidates who had recently qualified themselves both for the Home as well as the Indian Civil Service preferred the latter.

The grant of Exchange Compensation Allowance to the highly paid officers of the Government lays our rulers open to a serious complaint. It is said that these high officers of Government who are the masters of the situation have quietly added to their own salaries, while the humbler classes of public servants who can hardly

make two ends meet, who have to eke out their miserable pittance by resort to practices which will not bear the test of scrutiny, but which dire necessity imposes upon them, still continue to draw salaries which were fixed many many years ago. In Bengal a Salaries Commission, consisting of some of the highest officials in the land, was appointed in 1885. They submitted their Report in 1886. They recommended, having regard to the rise in the price of food grains, that an increase of at least 75 per cent. should be made to the pay of the ministerial servants of the Government. The recommendation has not been given effect to: it remains a dead letter. The question was prominently brought to the notice of the Lieutenant Governor at the meeting of the local Council when the Budget was discussed in April last. His Honour expressed sympathy with the proposal, but I am not aware that the matter has gone beyond the stage of a mere expression of a pious hope that some day, under better auspices and in more favourable times, the evil might be remedied. In the meantime my information is that the peons of the various Government offices, drawing wages varying from seven to ten rupees a month, and who had applied for increase, were told by Sir Charles Elliott that he could not grant their request, because, forsooth, in August and September last the price of common rice had gone down, and more than 12 seers of rice could be had for the rupee.

Ours is a political organization ; but we cannot overlook considerations which affect the development of our industries and our manufactures. The economic condition of a people has an intimate bearing upon their political advancement. Looking at the matter from this point of view we feel that it is our duty to safeguard our industries. Their conservation is a matter of grave national importance. We have our cotton industry in Bombay, the jute industry in Bengal, the tea industry in Assam and the coal and iron industries in Central and Southern India. Factory Acts which have hitherto been understood to be framed for the protection of operatives are now sought to be used for the avowed object of restricting and raising the cost of production, "Pressure," I understand, "is now to be put upon the Secretary of State to ignore the interests of the people of this country and to order a Factory Act for India, which will prevent our mills from competing with those in England." Lancashire people engaged in cotton industry have attacked the cotton industry in India, insisting on a stricter Factory Act and shorter working hours, quite oblivious of the hardships this would obviously entail on the people of India generally, and overlooking the fact that Japan is already a serious rival to India as well as England. Then the Jute manufacturing industry has been threatened by the Jute manufacturers in Dundee, on the plea that their trade is suffering from the competition of the Indian Mills. They too seem to forget the important factor that there are many Jute Mills on the continent of Europe and go straight for the Indian Mills, because they are under the British Government.

I now pass on to consider an important question which must soon engage a large share of public attention. You are aware that under the East India Company, Parliamentary Committees used to be appointed every 20 years on the eve of the

renewal of the Charter of the Company. Some of the most beneficent chapters in Indian history are associated with the labours of these Committees. The investigations of the Parliamentary Committee of 1833 led to the enactment of the Charter Act of that year. One of the happy results of the labours of the Parliamentary Committee of 1853 was the throwing open to general competition of the appointments in the Indian Civil Service. Apart from these direct results, these periodical enquiries exercised a healthy influence over the course of Indian administration. Indian officials after all are men, and when they knew that after every 20 years there would be this examination, this scrutiny into Indian affairs, they naturally were careful, as to the policy they pursued and as to the details of their administration. Ever since 1853—ever since India has passed under the Government of the Crown,—there has not been a Parliamentary Committee of Enquiry into Indian affairs, with the exception of the abortive Committee that was appointed when Lord Randolph Churchill was Secretary of State. The Committee collapsed almost as soon as it was appointed, owing to the dissolution of Parliament.

It will be my duty later on to refer to the labours of the British Committee and of the Indian Parliamentary Committee. But at this stage, I may be permitted to observe that the appointment of the Royal Commission was mainly due to their incessant and devoted efforts, and where all so richly deserve our thanks, it would be invidious to mention names. But if I am permitted to refer to any one who in a special degree is entitled to our acknowledgments, it is Sir William Wedderburn, the President of the British Committee. Sir William Wedderburn is well-known in this Presidency, but his is a name which is held in universal honour throughout India as that of a fearless, self-sacrificing, and devoted champion of Indian interests. The one idea upon which he has been ceaselessly harping, ever since his retirement from official life made it possible for him to devote himself, according to the natural impluses of his generous heart, to the service of the land of his adoption, was the appointment of a Royal Commission to enquire into Indian expenditure. It formed the theme of his eloquent address from the Presidential chair of the Congress held at Bombay; and at last success has crowned his efforts and those of his colleagues.

The Commission is now sitting. We regret the Commission has decided to carry on its deliberations with closed doors. We believe publicity would have materially helped the Commission in the important work in which it is engaged. "Light, kindly light," is what we need amid "the encircling gloom" that surrounds us. None the less we expect great results from the labours of the Commission. We are confident the labours of the Commission will mark an epoch in the history of our financial relations with England. Sir Henry Fowler had, indeed, observed, when the Commission was appointed, that no question of policy would lie within the competence of the Commission. The terms, however, of the appointment do not seem to me to exclude the consideration of the policy which governs the administration of the Civil and Military expenditure of the Empire. The terms are wide enough to include such a consideration. The Commission is appointed to enquire

into (*a*) "the administration and management of the military and civil expenditure incurred under the authority of the Secretary of State for India in Council or of the Government of India," and (*b*) "the apportionment of charge between the Governments of the United Kingdom and India for purposes in which both are interested."

The administration and management of the Civil and Military expenditure of the Empire necessarily includes considerations of policy. To hold otherwise would be to unduly limit the scope of the enquiry, and to restrict it to mere matters of account keeping. As the *Times* truly says :—"Any curtailment of the scope of the Royal Commission's enquiry which might debar reasonable men from coming to a conclusion on these questions would be received with disappointment in England and with deep dissatisfaction throughout India."

The second part of the enquiry is, if possible, of still greater importance. It intimately affects the Home Charges. Our complaint is that the Indian Exchequer is saddled with charges which should not be thrown upon us. It is not a complaint uttered by irresponsible critics in the Press, but it is a complaint to which statesmen of the eminence of the Duke of Argyle, Lord Northbrook, and others have lent the weight of their names. I have no right to anticipate the decision of the Commission, but I am sure I re-echo your sentiments when I say that the people of India appeal to the Commission for justice, for that financial justice, for which they have cried so often, but have hitherto cried in vain.

We too have a duty to perform in this connection. Three members of the British Committee are on the Commission. We know how nobly they are doing their work. But our side of the case must be represented, and adequately represented. The Commission must be placed in touch with popular opinion in India. In this matter I am happy to be able to say that we are in complete accord with our Anglo-Indian fellow-subjects. In the whole compass of the political literature of the last ten years, there is nothing more searching, yet more discriminating, than Sir Griffith Evans' criticism on the Home Charges. Every Association in the country ought to send representations to the Commission, bearing on the question of Indian expenditure, and on the adjustment of charges between India and England. There should go forth from us an unequivocal and emphatic demonstration against the present system by which England throws upon India charges incidental to her Imperial responsibility, and which in equity ought to be shared between the two countries, with some reference not only to the mutual benefits derived, but also to the capacity of each country to bear the burden.

The question of the wider employment of our countrymen in the public service is, to my mind, more or less a financial problem. It is intimately connected with the question of the poverty of the people. That is the view of Mr. Dadabhai Naoroji ; that was the view of the late Mr. Robert Knight, than whom there was not an abler financial expert or a more ardent friend of the people of India. The considerations bearing upon this point are obvious. The more of the foreign element there is in the public service, with the high pay which must necessarily be

given to them for service in a foreign country, the more you widen and deepen that channel by which the wealth of the country flows out—the greater is the impetus you give to that drain which is going on and which has gone on for the last hundred years and more, and which is more or less incidental to the present state of things. A part of the salaries of these highly paid officials must be spent out of the country, for the support of their wives and children, while they are yet in the service; and when they have retired, the whole of their pensions, with exceptions which hardly call for notice, must be spent abroad. This means the loss of this portion of the national wealth which is absolutely indefensible, if substantially service of the same quality could be obtained by employing the children of the soil. The employment of a foreign element in the public service of a country, with the prospect of the salaries of these public servants leaving the country, is morally wrong, economically disastrous, and politically inexpedient, unless it is evident that the gain in other respects outweighs the financial loss, or in the end averts greater financial loss, than what is incidental to the employment of this foreign agency. (*hear, hear.*)

We fully recognize the fact that British capital has been sunk in the development of the resources of the country. We are grateful to British capitalists for the boon. Their enterprise has afforded us great advantages: it has given an impetus to trade and commerce: it has facilitated intercourse between the most distant parts of the Empire: it has annihilated time and space. But in regard to the great Railway undertakings, to which I chiefly refer, the capital is English, mostly in gold, which adds to the unfavourable exchange, the higher employes are English, the bulk of the profits goes to England. The drain continues, though undoubtedly the resources of the country being developed, it is better able to bear the strain.

In asking for the wider employment of our countrymen in the public service, we not only take our stand upon the solemn promises of our Soveregin, which we cherish with the most affectionate ardour, but we rely upon high considerations of expediency. We are interested in the solvency of the Empire—in the financial stability of the Government; for with it are bound up the happiness and prosperity of our people. Therefore it is that we make this demand. The financial consideration runs through it all.

Abject, deplorable poverty is the prolific parent of public disorders. A people groaning under an intolerable load of poverty, with whom existence is a burden, have no interest in the maintenance of the public tranquillity; there is no project, however wild or reckless or inconsistent with the public interests, which in their desperation they might not adopt. I need not quote familiar instances in the history of the world. Oriental nature is not materially different from human nature in other parts of the world.

We all deplore the recent disturbances between Hindus and Mahomedans. We would give worlds to avert them. They throw back the cause of political advancement. But how rare is it that we find respectable people mixed up in these

disturbances. People who have anything to lose will not expose themselves to the risk. Those who have nothing to lose, with whom existence is one long incessant struggle, would dare all things and do all things. A people steeped in poverty represents a political danger, the magnitude of which it is difficult to exaggerate.

How does this public service question stand? The resolution of the House of Commons of the 2nd June 1893, in favour of Simultaneous Examinations, stands there in the journals of the House. It has not been cancelled. Nor has it been given effect to. What has happened since we met last? A number of petitions has been presented to the House in support of the Resolution to which I have referred, but not as many as one might have wished or hoped for, having regard to the importance of the question and the magnitude of our interests therein. I am bound to say that we have not done our duty in this matter. I feel called upon to repeat the appeal I made last year that we should go on presenting petitions to the House of Commons till we get what we want. Let us convince the British public that we are in earnest about this matter, and I am confident that justice will be done to us. It is no use recording a Resolution here once a year, and then going to sleep over it for the rest of the twelve months.

Never did the case for Simultaneous Examinations receive a more striking measure of support than from the results of the open Competitive Examination for 1895. There were sixty-six vacancies. There were several Indian candidates. But only one passed, Mr. Shaik Ashgar Ali of the Punjab. In your name I desire to congratulate this gentleman, chiefly because he is a Mahomedan and a native of the Punjab. I should like to put it to the staunchest opponent of Simultaneous Examinations to say if the success of this solitary native of India represents justice —adequate justice to India. The *Pioneer* newspaper, referring to this year's Final Examination, remarked that, having regard to the results, the case for Simultaneous Examinations must now be considered to be hopeless. What are the results which are supposed to justify this inference? A Mahomedan gentleman was at the top of the list at the Final Examination, and three other Indian candidates occupied very high places. But in considering the results of the Final Examination in their bearing upon the question of Simultaneous Examinations, we must also take into account the results of the Open Competitive Examination for the same year; and if we do so, we are forced to the conclusion that they accentuate the necessity for holding Simultaneous Examinations, both as a matter of justice to India, and with a view to ensure the efficiency of the Service.

I desire to put this question of the efficiency of the Civil Service in the foreground. I am distinctly of opinion that Simultaneous Examinations would add to its efficiency; and the results of the recent Open Competitive Examination certainly point to that conclusion. Look at the disparity of marks between the successful candidates at the top and those at the bottom of the list, say between the first ten and the last ten candidates. As regards the first ten candidates, the marks vary from 2,125 to 3,738; as regards the last ten, the marks vary form 1,493 to 1,587. If these marks are to be regarded as any test

of merit, it must be admitted that there was a great and unusual disparity in respect of merit, between the men at the top and the men at the bottom. If a selection could have been made from a wider field, if the examination was held in India as well as in England, it is reasonable to infer that there would have been some chance of this disparity being removed, and perhaps a better class of candidates selected in the place of those occupying the places at the bottom of the list. It is impossible to resist this conclusion, and to that extent it is impossible to shut our eyes to that other conclusion to which it points, that Simultaneous Examinations are calculated to add to the efficiency of the Service, by widening the field of selection. I regard it as a *sine qua non* that the selected candidates should be required to complete their period of probation in England.

One word more before I leave the question of Simultaneous Examinations. One of the objections raised was that if Simultaneous Examinations were granted, it would involve unfairness to the martial races: the Mahomedans and the Sikhs would have no chance. The results of this and last year's Examinations afford a complete contradiction to this view of the matter. The only successful Indian candidate at the Open Competitive Examination for 1895 was a Mahomedan gentleman; among the successful candidates for 1894 was a Sikh gentleman; and last, but not least, the candidate who heads the list of passed probationers at the Final Examination for this year is a Mahomedan. Our Mahomedan fellow-countrymen are rapidly coming to the forefront, and I think I express the sense of this Congress when I say that we all await with pleasure the advent of that day when in full association with Hindus and others in their intellectual activities, they will stand shoulder to shoulder with them in that political struggle which will only end when Hindus and Mahomedans, and Parsis and Sikhs, all races and all creeds in India, will have won for themselves the full rights of British citizenship.

You will remember that the Resolution of the House of Commons did not concern the Covenanted Civil Service alone. It referred to all Civil Services, and it affirmed the principle of Simultaneous Examinations in regard to them all. In Bengal a qualified sort of Competitive Examination is held for selection to the office of Assistant and District Superintendents. A similar examination is held in London. The examinations are not held simultaneously. They are not held at the same time; nor are the same papers set. That is not, however, what we complain of. We have a much more serious grievance when you consider the matter from another point of view. Natives of India are excluded from these examinations. They are not allowed to compete. They are to be promoted to the office of Assistant and District Superintendents of Police from among the rank of Inspectors.

I have carefully read the Report of the Public Service Commission. There is absolutely nothing in the recommendations of the Public Service Commission to justify this exclusion. The Commission recommend (*vide* page 121 of their Report) "limited competition amongst candidates selected in England," and similar "competition amongst candidates selected in India." They further say that

"endeavours should be made to introduce a reasonable proportion of Native officers in the higher ranks of the Police." The grievance to which I refer has formed the subject of representations to the Government of Bengal and the Government of India, but so far without any result.

The Government seems to be of opinion that racial distinctions imply moral distinctions, distinctions of character, which involve the possession of one set of moral qualities rather than another. With the express declaration of the Charter Act of 1833, which lays down that "No Native of the said territories, nor any natural-born subject of His Majesty resident therein, shall by reason of his religion, place of birth, descent, colour, or any of them be excluded from any office under the said Company"—with the gracious message of the Queen's Proclamation still ringing in our ears—let me repeat those noble words—"Our subjects of whatever race or creed be freely admitted to all offices the duties of which they may be qualified by their education, their ability, and their integrity duly to discharge,"—with this express provision in the Charter Act and with the gracious assurance of our Sovereign—it is too late in the day to fall back upon mere racial considerations. Racial qualifications are not moral qualifications. The Competitive Examination is a better test of moral qualifications than the mere accident of race. It must be so in the nature of things; for what inequalities of temper, of character and disposition, do we not observe among members of the same race? This question was thoroughly gone into by the Committee that was appointed with Lord Macaulay at its head, on the eve of the creation of the system of Open Competitive Examinations for appointments to the Indian Civil Service. The Committee submitted its Report in 1854 to Sir Charles Wood, and in that Report the Committee thus observed:—

"Early superiority in science and literature generally indicates the existence of some qualities which are securities against vice, industry, self-denial, a taste for pleasures not sensual, a laudable desire of honorable distinction, a still more laudable desire to obtain the approbation of friends and relations. We therefore believe that the intellectual test which is about to be established will be found in practice to be also the best moral test which can be devised."

I should not have thought it necessary to refer to this all but forgotten controversy, were it not that there is a distinct indication of public opinion in some quarters, so notably displayed in the Despatches published in the "Blue Book on Simultaneous Examinations," in favour of the system of nomination as against competition—a feeling that competition as between members of the same race is a good test, but is inadequate and ineffectual as a test, as between members of different races and nationalities. I am free to admit that competition does not represent a perfect test. But there is nothing perfect in this world. Human institutions suffer from the original taint of imperfection. It is the best practicable test we have.

We claim to be admitted to all competitive examinations for the Indian Services, no matter to what particular department of the public service they may refer. We claim to be admitted to the Competitive Examinations for the Police Service

held in India as well as in England. We claim to be admitted to the Examinations for recruitment to the higher offices in the Forest Department. We are excluded from these Examinations, and we are excluded because we are natives of India. Our disqualification is our race. The crime of colour is alleged against us. We are supposed not to possess the qualities required for these services, by reason of our being members of the race to which it is our misfortune to belong. But there are so many races in India. Do they all suffer from the same disqualification—are they all wanting in the precious qualities required for these services? For the exclusion applies to them all. A slur is thus put upon us. But we are not ashamed of our nationality. We are proud that we are Indians; some of us are the inheritors of a civilization which carries the mind back to the dawn of human civilization. But we arealso British subjects. *Civis Romanus sum* was the boast of the ancient world. It is our proud privilege to be British subjects, and we claim the rights which belong to our political connection. We are confident that the English people will not permit the perpetuation of invidious distinctions of race in the government of their great Dependency. Themselves free men, all in the enjoyment of equal rights and equal privileges, their natural instinct would be to extend to others the blessings which have made them so great, so happy, and so prosperous.

In this connection it is impossible not to refer to the exclusion of our countrymen from the commissioned ranks in the Army. The bravest Native soldier, a born warrior, and though he may have in him the making of a great Captain, cannot in these days rise beyond the rank of a Subadar-Major or a Ressaldar-Major in the British Army. A Sivaji, a Hyder Ali, a Ranjit Singh, a Madhaji Scindia, could not now have risen to the position of the Colonel of a Regiment or the Captain of a Company. This ostracism of a whole people, this exclusion of the representatives of the Military races in India from high command in the Army, cannot add to the strength and the stability or the greatness of the Empire. The Romans, the up-builders of the mightiest Empire in the ancient world, followed a different policy. Gibbon says :—" But in the eye of the law all Roman citizens were equal, and all the subjects of the Empire were citizens of Rome.., and the bold adventurer from Germany or Arabia was admitted with equal favour to the Civil or Military command which citizens alone had been once entitled to assume over the conquests of his fathers (p. 45, Chap. XLIV., Vol. V " Gibbon's Decline and Fall of the Roman Empire.") Trust in the people, confidence in the ruled, is the secret of successful imperial sway. Never was there a more striking illustration of this truth than in the splendid results which followed the adoption of this policy by Akbar. A stranger to the country, the son of a prince who had been driven from his throne, beset with enormous difficulties at the commencement of his reign, he surmounted them all and founded the mightiest Empire of his time, which for nearly two centuries continued to flourish with undiminished vigour. What was the secret? Where had Akbar learnt it? He loved the people and trusted them. They returned his love with an abundant measure of gratitude which constituted the greatest bulwark of his throne. The grandsons of those who had fought against

his grandfather became his ministers, the rulers of his Provinces, the Captains of his Army. Raja Man Singh carried the Moghul standard from the wilds of Assam to the mountain passes of Afghanistan. Himself a Hindu, he was made the Governor of the Mahomedan province of Cabul; and he subjugated for his Mahomedan Sovereign the Hindu province of Bengal. Birbal, another Hindu favourite, was sent in charge of an expedition to punish the Yusufzais in Swat, and when the news of his death was brought, his Sovereign shed floods of tears. In the words of Colonel Malleson: "To all alike, whether Uzbek, or Afghan, or Hindu, or Parsi or Christian, he offered careers, provided only that they were faithful, intelligent, true to themselves." Russian despotism is not, indeed, to be compared to the benevolent rule of the British in India. But the native subjects of the Czar in Central Asia are admitted to the commissioned ranks in the Army. Here in Congress from year to year we record a Resolution in favor of the establishment of a Military College in India at which natives of India may be educated and trained for a military career. I understand that His Royal Highness the Duke of Connaught, when he was Commander-in-Chief of the Bombay Army, expressed himself in favour of such an institution, as affording a training-ground for the scions of respectable families among the martial races in India who might aspire to military distinction. The martial races have done splendid service in the up-building of the empire. An outlet should be provided for the gratification of their legitimate ambition. Thus wrote the shrewd, the wise, the statesman-like Sir Henry Lawrence many many years ago:—

"If Aisatics and Africans can obtain honourable position in the Armies of Russia and France, surely Indians, after a tried service of a century under England's banner, are entitled to the same boon, nay, justice.

The question of the separation of the Civil and Military Medical Services will engage your attention. For the agitation in this matter we are indebted to the indefatigable efforts of Dr. Bahadurji and his associates. They have brought it within the range of practical politics, and, as I learn, have secured the sympathies of so earnest and influential a medical reformer as Dr. Ernest Hart. The question is not a mere professional one. It has a public side to it. The profession is interested, and the public also interested. I have great respect for the Indian Medical Service. The members of that Service have been the pioneers in this country of the system of medicine as taught in Europe; but it is no disparagement to the Service to say that it is not fit for anything and everything, that it has not the exclusive monopoly of the knowledge of the most recent advances made in medical science, and that professorial and scientific work may require special training for which the Service may not afford facilities.

In this connection I may be permitted to refer, on the authority of the *Glasgow Herald*, to a recent ruling by the Secretary of State for India, under which he reserves to himself the discretion to disqualify a candidate for the Indian Medical Service who may have been considered qualified by the examiners. This is what the *Glasgow Herald* says:—

"Thirty-three candidates, four of whom are natives of India, will compete for sixteen vacancies in the Indian Medical Service on 2nd proximo. The Secretary of State for India, it should be noted, now has the power of rejecting any candidate who has been successful at the examination. This was not the case until a few months ago. A candidate who succeeded in passing the examination recently, and was able to produce the necessary certificates as to moral character, was objected to by the India Office authorities, but they were compelled to accept him. Immediate authority was, however, sought by the Secretary of State from Parliament, and in future the appointment of any successful competitor who may be considered an undesirable person by the Military Department and Medical Board at the India office will be vetoed."

We have sufficient confidence in Secretaries of State to feel assured that the discretion here claimed will not be capriciously exercised. But when such a rule does not obtain in respect of any other competitive examination which regulates public appointments in India, the justification for this departure from ordinary practice does not seem to be apparent.

The question of the separation of Judical and Executive functions in the administration of criminal justice has always formed a chief plank in the Congress platform. It is one of those questions which we claim to have brought within the range of practical politics. Lord Dufferin declared it to be "a counsel of perfection; and two successive Secretaries of State, representing the two political parties in England, Lord Cross and Lord Kimberley, both expressed themselves in favor of this reform. The wisdom of the proposal is thus admitted in the abstract. But no serious effort has yet been made to recognize it in the practical work of administration. Mr. R. C. Dutt has showed in his admirable Note which we have more than once considered in this Congress that the reform may be carried out with little or no extra expenditure. Sir Richard Garth has again and again accentuated the need for the introduction of this reform. Every year cases occur which add to the ever-accumulating evidence on the subject. I desire to make a suggestion in this connection for your consideration. I think a Blue-Book should be published every year from each Province by some recognized Association giving the cases occurring in that Province, which point to the need for the speedy carrying out of this reform. We shall then have paved the way for the reform by the inexorable logic of facts which will carry home conviction to every unprejudiced mind. A Resolution of the House of Commons in favor of the reform would perhaps help the Government to introduce it. Of course, a large measure of discretion must be vested in the Government in the carrying out of the reform.

The question is really not one of expense but is more or less one of prestige. In the official mind—I should not like to say this of all officials—there are many officials who think differently, Mr. R. C. Dutt is himself an official—there seems to be an idea that to deprive the chief executive officer of the District of his judicial powers would be to deprive him of his prestige and lower him in the estimation of the public. But surely prestige that is bound up with a system which in theory is indefensible, and

which in practice leads to injustice, is a very poor sort of prestige indeed, and must defeat its own object. Prestige which perpetuates injustice and excites discontent and dissatisfaction among the masses, for they are the chief sufferers by this injustice, is not worth having. It is no aid to the Government. It is a source of weakness and embarrassment. The old Scriptural text is true now as it was in the primitive days when it fell from prophetic lips—"Righteousness exalteth a nation." No Government can afford, under any pretext whatsoever—call it prestige, call it policy, call it by what name you like—to do aught or to suffer aught which may lead to defeat the ends of justice as between man and man, which all Governments are commissioned by a writ from on High to maintain and promote.

Again I admit that Governments are bound to proceed with caution. I would find fault with a Government that was not cautious, reasonably cautious, against which the charge of recklessness could be brought in any form or shape whether in regard to the people's money or the people's happiness or convenience ; but the Government may in this connection begin the experiment in selected Districts and await the result. I am afraid there may be parts of the country so disturbed that an experiment of this kind may not be desirable in the public interests. But, having admitted that the proposal embodies a counsel of perfection, public opinion has a legitimate right to ask Government to move on, and to give effect to it in a cautious and tentative spirit. It will not do in these days to recognize the perfection of a principle in the abstract, and then refuse to give effect to it in practice. The present position of absolute inaction on the part of the Government in this matter is untenable. Let a great Government like ours yield before the importunate clamour of public opinion has assumed proportions, where a concession made will have the appearance of having been wrung under compulsion. Let not the words "too late" be written upon the policy of Government in this or in other matters.

In this connection I cannot help referring to the deplorable instances of failure of justice in many criminal cases where Europeans are the accused and natives of India are the aggrieved party. It is a difficult and delicate matter to deal with ; but we have a right to appeal for help to all right-minded Englishmen interested in upholding the fair fame of British justice. The Court of Directors in a despatch that is well-known observed that it was not only necessary that justice should be done in India, but that the people should be convinced that justice has been done. Sir James Fitz-Stephen, a disciple of Carlyle, a worshipper of the doctrine of might as against right, of the doctrine of force as against the principle of moral persuasion in the Government of communities, declared from his place in the Supreme Legislative Council that a single act of injustice done or believed to be done was more disastrous to British rule than a great reverse on an Asiatic battle-field. It is because we know that this class of cases is creating a great deal of dissatisfaction and discontent among the masses and is weakening the hold of the Government upon them, that we feel it our duty to call prominent attention to that matter. A writer in the columns of *India* suggests a modification of the law which is worth considering. He says :—

"I believe that in cases like the above the Court ought to be a mixed court, *i. e.*, one of the Judges ought to be Native and the other a European; and that the Jury should be half European and half Native. This is the only practical means by which a great scandal in our administration of justice can be removed and a serious political danger obviated."

Two Bills are now before the Supreme Legislative Council which will demand your earnest attention—the Legal Practitioners' Bill and the Jury Bill. There is a feeling in some quarters that a wave of reaction has set in and is unsettling the minds of our rulers. We all recognise the fact that human progress is largely made up of action and re-action; that the cause of reform never moves forward in straight line, but that it swings backward and forward like the pendulum of a clock; and that the forward movement more than makes up for the rebound. However that may be, both these Bills have filled the public mind with alarm, which, in the case of the Jury Bill, has partly been removed by the re-assuring message which His Excellency the Viceroy was able to give to the Poona Sarvajanik Sabha in reply to their address. The object of the Legal Practitioners' Bill is to spppress law-touts. With that everybody will sympathise. But those who object to the Bill say, and I think with great force, that the Bill is calculated to suppress Mofussil Pleaders rather than law-touts. Certain it is that the Bill proposes some very serious innovations. It proposes to arm the District Judge and the Commissioner of the Division with the power of removing a Pleader, and the Commissioner of the Division with the power of removing a Revenue Agent. Under the Legal Practitioners' Act of 1879, this power belongs exclusively to the High Court. It is a power which with the exception of a brief intermission of a few years, has always been vested in the High Court. The District Courts can only make recommendations in this behalf. A power like this vested in the District Courts would, it was strongly urged at the Calcutta Meeting, deal a heavy blow at the independence of the Mofussil Bar. Pleaders will practise with a halter round their necks. They dare not hurt the susceptibilities of the District *Hakims*. They dare not show excess of zeal in any case in which local official opinion may have been enlisted against their client. The client will suffer. The public will suffer. Undoubtedly the dismissed Pleader will have the right to appeal to the High Court. But it is one thing to contest an open recommendation, and quite a different thing to seek to upset a final verdict. I may here remark that Her Majesty's Judges of the superior Courts in England have not the power of disbarring a barrister practising before such Courts. It is only the Benchers of the Inn of Court to which a barrister happens to belong who can disbar him. When Her Majesty's Judges in England cannot dismiss practitioners who appear before them, surely such a power should not be vested in our Mofussil Judges.

The question is no. one that merely concerns lawyers. It has an important public bearing. The public are quite as interested as the lawyers. The independence of the Mofussil Bar is a matter of public concern. To imperil their

independence is to aim a blow at the beginnings of national life, and to sap the springs of constitutional agitation in the Mofussil. The Bar constitute the pillar of our public movements. Our Mofussil Pleaders are the life and soul of our Municipalities and our District Boards. They are the secretaries and working members of our religious and social institutions. There is no movement in the Mofussil which does not owe its origin to them, or is not mainly guided by them. With such a law as this, they dare not take part in public movements, especially of a political character which might expose them to the displeasure of the local officials. It would be a public misfortune, it would throw back the cause of reform, if a law were passed which would interfere with the independence of such a useful body of men.

The Jury Notification was issued as you know in 1892. A Commission was appointed in 1893 to report upon the matter. The Notification, as you are aware, was subsequently withdrawn. The object of the present Bill is, as defined in the statement of Objects and Reasons, to give effect to such of the recommendations of the Jury Commission as have been approved of by the Government of India and Her Majesty's Secretary of State. The most important provision of the Bill is that which refers to the amendment of Section 303 of the Criminal Procedure Code, empowering Judges to require Juries to bring in special verdicts. But this is precisely the provision of the Bill, which is in entire conflict with the recommendation of the Jury Commission. This question of special verdicts was considered by them, and was unanimously rejected. And who were the members of the Jury Commission? The President was a Judge of the Calcutta High Court. Among the Members were Sir Romesh Chunder Mitter, late Officiating Chief Justice of Bengal; Mr. Wilkins, the present Legal Remembrancer; and last but not least, Sir Griffith Evans, the present Officiating Advocate-General, in whom the Government has such great confidence that ever since 1878 the Government has continued appointing him as a Member of the Supreme Legislative Council. Apart from the weight which must belong to the opinion of such a body of men, we find the views of the Jury Commission in this respect are supported by high authority. The High Court of Calcutta describe the proposed amendment as "a radical and dangerous change in the law." The majority of the Judges of the Bombay High Court do not consider the amendment as called for, and the Government of Bengal, which issued the Jury Notification in 1892, accords to it only a qualified measure of support. "After full consideration," says the letter of the Bengal Government, "the Lieutenant-Governor is disposed to agree with the Commission (the Jury Commission) that there is no absolute necessity for a change, as under the present law a Judge can and a good Judge does, put the issue before the Jury, so that they should be obliged to give a verdict on each point; but since all Judges do not, Sir Charles Elliott would prefer to see such a change made in the wording of Section 303 as shall show that the procedure should always be as above described, the Judge laying down each issue and calling on the Jury for a special verdict on each." The Lieutenant-Governor of Bengal is of opinion that "there is no absolute

necessity for this change in the law" if a good Judge could always be found to preside at a Sessions trial in a Jury District. The Judicial Branch of the Civil Service in Bengal is surely not so wanting in capable men that it would be difficult to find good Judges for the few Districts where Trial by Jury prevails. It seems to me that it would be very unwise to enact a law which is likely to create a great deal of public dissatisfaction, when the evil complained of, if it is real, might be remedied by administrative arrangements, unattended with any expense or inconvenience.

The Hon'ble Member in charge of the Bill in commenting upon this provision, remarked that it was liable to be attended with abuse. It seems, however, that there is no real cause for alarm, so far as this particular section of the Bill is concerned. We have the assurance of His Excellency the Viceroy that the effective, but at the same time the conservative, administration of the law would be secured and in a form that would recommend itself to the approval of public opinion. The Poona Sarvajanik Sabha is to be congratulated upon having obtained this expression of opinion from His Excellency. I will quote the words of His Excellency in this place :—

" I do not think it would be proper for me to enter into any discussion of the details of a Bill now before the Legislative Council, but I may say a word or two as to procedure. I cannot help thinking that a wholly disproportionate excitement has been got up over this matter. I gather that you, at all events, assent, unreservedly, to the recommendations of the Jury Commission, and acknowledge, therefore, that reforms are desirable in the law. On one point there is admittedly great difference of opinion. If the Government had ignored that point and left it out of the Bill, this difference of opinion, and all the consequences that result from differences of opinion would have remained. The Government thought it better that this point should be carefully and deliberately considered, and it will be carefully and deliberately considered in the proceedings of the Legislative Council. As the Hon'ble Member who introduced the Bill stated at the time, that is the object with which the Government have introduced this particular provision, and I venture to hope that by the co-operation of all who take an interest in the due, the effective, but still in the conservative administration of the Law, the result of the discussions in Calcutta will be that the law will be put into a shape which will meet the approval of your Sabha as well as the rest of the community."

I think I express the sense of this Congress when I say that we are all deeply grateful to His Excellency for this re-assuring message. The provision of the Bill, in regard to the appointment of special jurors is, I think, a distinct improvement.

The system of Trial by Jury in the form in which it exists is undoubtedly English in its character. But the principle which underlies it is the principle of the *Panchayet* system, which in this country is as old as the hills, and is graven deep on the instincts of the people. I think it will be admitted on all hands, that on the whole the experiment has been a success and therefore we are justified in calling for an extension of the system, for which, indeed, we have repeatedly prayed, and which, we find, is supported by the high authority of Sir Romesh Chunder Mitter,

one of the members of the Jury Commission. I am glad to learn that the Government of Bengal has recommended the extension of the system to six new districts. That Government is to be congratulated on this decision.

There are other important questions included in your programme. If I had time I should have liked to have dwelt upon them : I should have specially liked to have referred to the question of Excise and the question of Education. We must press for local option. The Government has no right to thrust liquor-shops upon unwilling communities. We must safeguard the interests of Education—primary, technical, and high. I am bound to say that the Government expenditure on Education is small when compared with similar expenditure incurred in other countries, and it is inadequate to the growing requirements of a progressive community like ours. It is my contention that in India the expenditure per head of the population is the lowest as compared with British possessions in other parts of the world—in Asia, America, Africa and the Australian Continent. Here is a table which I have drawn up and which bears out this view of the matter:—

Countries.	Population.	State expenditure on Education.	Cost per head. s. d.
Great Britain & Ireland	37,879,285	£7,569,066	3—11¾
Belgium	6,069,321	£676,297	2 2¾
France	38,343,192	£2,761,723	1 5¾
Russia	115,226,542	£3,820,496¼s.	3½
United States . .	62,622,250	£32,528,328	10 4⅔
S. African Republic	119,128	£43,823	7 4¾
New South Wales . .	1,132,234	£693,652	12 3
New Zealand . .	626,658	£411,922	13 1⅝
Queensland	393,718	£253,758	12—10⅔
Tasmania	146,667	£44,864	6 1½
Victoria	1,140,405	£739,784	12—11⅔
Western Australia . .	49,782	£10,397	4 2¼
Cape Colony . .	1,527,224	£147,424	1—11⅙
Natal	543,913	£34,188	1 3/15
British Guiana . .	288,328	£18,116	1 3-1/13
Jamaica	648,558	£30,786	11-2/5
Mauritius	71,655	Rs. 45,352	As. 10 Ps. 1½
Ceylon	3,008,466	Rs. 508,116	,, 2 ,, ½
India	221,172,958	Rs. 8,211,820	,, 0 ,, 7-1/7
Bengal	70,000,000	Rs. 2,646,000	,, 0 ,, 7¼

Thus it will be seen that while the expenditure on education per head of the population in Ceylon is over 2 ans., in Mauritius, it is 10 ans., in Natal, 1*s*. 3*d*., in British Guiana, it is over 1*s*. 3*d*. and even in Russia it is 3½*d*., in India, it is only little over 7 *pies*. Comment on these figures is unnecessary. I cannot say whether these figures include contributions made by local bodies. Even if such contributions were to be added, it would not, I think, make an appreciable difference.

We are indebted to Professor Oxenham for his defence of High Education.

We are not in favour of High Education *vs.* Primary Education. We are in favour of all Education, high and low. They act and re-act upon each other. They are part and parcel of a common and indissoluble system. High Education does not benefit the recipients alone. It benefits the whole community, for if John Stuart Mill is to be accepted as our authority in these matters, the ideas of the educated classes filter downwards and become the ideas of the masses.

It has, indeed, been said that we should not take up too many questions, that we should content ourselves with a few, and press them upon the attention of Government. There is considerable force in this observation. By covering a wider ground, we lose in concentration, and we run the risk of losing in effect. The more important questions are apt to be lost sight of in the consideration of the less important ones. From the point of view of presentation to Government, this is a disadvantage! But the Congress being national, its interests embracing the whole field of national concerns, it is difficult to curtail our programme, without leaving untouched a large number of questions which affect important interests. I think, however, we may adopt a middle course. I think we should give special prominence to a few questions only, such as Indian Finance, including the Home Charges and Military Expenditure, the separation of Judical and Executive functions, the question of Simultaneous Examinations, the still further reform of the Legislative Councils, and one or two other matters which might be mentioned.

From the consideration of our work here we may pass on to discuss our work in England. Our voice would be that of one crying in the wilderness but for our organization in London, the British Committee, our paper *India*, and our Parliamentary Committee. The money that we spend in England is worth its weight in gold. (*Hear, hear*) It fructifies abundantly in the increasing interest which is being created in England in regard to Indian affairs. It is preparing the way for an abundant harvest of good in which, under the Providence of God, our children and our children's children are destined to share. But how shall we fittingly describe the services of those good men and true, with Sir William Wedderburn at their head, who ungrudgingly devote their time and attention, often at considerable personal sacrifice, to work for us on the British Committee and the Parliamentary Committee ! They say the word "gratitude" does not occur in our language. But the sentiment is there, deep-rooted in the hearts of our people ; and in your name I desire to express our sense of profound gratitude to the members of the British Committee, and of the Indian Parliamentary Committee, for their disinterested services to India.

Never was there greater need than now for vigilance both here and in England. At the recent General Elections, our Parliamentary friends sustained a defeat all along the line, Mr. Dadabhai Naoroji, Mr. Herbert Paul, Mr. W. S. Caine,(*Cheers*) and other friends of Indian reform, have all lost their seats, though we hope constituencies will soon be found for them which will return them to Parliament. My distinguished friend Mr. W. C. Bonnerjee fought in the Liberal interest as bravely as man ever fought, (*Loud Cheers*) but he too was defeated. Mr. Bhownuggree

has been returned to Parliament in the Conservative interests. I hope and trust Mr. Bhownuggree will find time to read our programme and our proceedings: and if he does so, I am sure he will find that we are as warmly interested as we could be in the maintenance of Imperial unity, and that we are advocates of reform and not of revolution, and of reform as a safeguard against revolution. He must know that reforms indefinitely postponed lead to violent changes—that reforms quietly, steadily, cautiously introduced, so that the new adapts itself to the old and the old becomes a part of the new, add to the stability and strength of Governments. I hope that as the result of his studies he will see his way to sympathize with our programme. His conservatism in English politics need not stand in the way of his adoption of the very moderate programme of the Congress. Sir Richard Garth is a Conservative in politics. He is not able to accept the whole of our programme—he is not in favour of Simultaneous Examinations; but there is no stauncher friend of the Congress movement, whether among Liberals or Conservatives, and we Congressmen are deeply beholden to him for his defence of our cause, when it was assailed by the late Sir George Chesney.

We have endeavoured so far to steer clear of party politics. But the bulk of our friends belong to the Liberal side. With the exception of Mr. Pincott and Sir Richard Garth, I cannot at this moment think of any Conservative politician who sympathises with the Congress movement. From the Liberal ranks we have received the largest measure of sympathy. When the delegates went to England in 1890 it was the Liberal Associations which organized their meetings in the Provincial centres. When the Liberals came into power, their sympathy with our popular aspirations was marked. It was a Liberal Parliament that recorded the Resolution in favour of Simultaneous Examinations, though I regret to say that it was a Liberal Secretary of State who nullified that Resolution. It was a Liberal Government that practically ordered the withdrawal of the Jury Notification. It was the mandate of a Liberal Secretary of State, Lord Kimberley, that saved in Bengal the system of Local Self-Government menaced by the Municipal Bill of 1892. It was a Liberal Government, too, that re-imposed the import duties on cotton goods in the interests of India.

Speaking for myself, I will say this, that until Indian questions are taken up as party questions, until they become factors in determining the issues of party contests, they cannot occupy a prominent place in English politics, or engage a large measure of public attention in England. Before the English people can be expected to do justice to India, they must feel an interest in Indian topics, and they will not, and cannot, feel any interest in them, so long as Indian questions remain outside the pale of party politics. We have it on the authority of John Morley that "Indian affairs entered materially into the great battle of parties" in the last century, and the impeachment of Warren Hastings, which for its moral results was a great and far-reaching event, was mainly prompted by party considerations.

What is our attitude with regard to the Government ? I decline to discuss the charge of disloyalty which used to be brought against us in the early days of the Congress movement. Having regard to the official recognition which was extended to us by Lord Lansdowne's Government, this is no longer a question of practical politics. Are we then Her Majesty's constitutional Opposition in this country ? I hardly think so. Our position is not analogous to that of a Parliamentary Opposition. A Parliamentary Opposition is bound to oppose all measures of the Government. It is its duty to oppose. It opposes for the mere sake of opposition. Its opposition is actuated by considerations of party spirit, under the influence of which the motives and the policy of the Government are liable to be needlessly aspersed. Our position is different. We are not bound to oppose the measures of Government. We are not expected to do so. Our countrymen would have a ground of complaint against us, if we did so, without sufficient cause. We do not oppose for the mere sake of opposition, and with a view to embarrass the Government, so that we may step into its place when the position is no longer tenable. We oppose bad measures. We support good measures. We may oppose the policy of the Government, but we impute no motives. Above all, our opposition is not dictated by any considerations of party-spirit, but by the sole and single-minded desire to serve our countrymen and to broaden and deepen the foundations of British rule upon the unchangeable basis of a nation's affections.

We should suffer a distinct loss of power, were we to constitute ourselves into permanent opposition to the Government. If we oppose with discrimination and judgment, our protests will not fail to command sympathy and respect. But if we oppose in the spirit of captious fault-finding, if we oppose for the mere sake of opposition, if we oppose simply because somebody must oppose, we expose ourselves to the risk of being considered hostile critics, even when our representations deserve a better fate.

To-day is the first day of the eleventh session of the Congress. Many sessions of the Congress must yet be held before even our moderate programme is accomplished. The car of human progress moves slowly forward. But he who has set his hand to the plough cannot afford to look back. He must spend and be spent in the cause. How many brave comrades, whose memories we mourn, have fallen ; how many more will yet fall before the journey through the wilderness is accomplished, and we are in view of Canaan. To some choice spirits, elevated by faith and hope, may be vouchsafed, as was vouchsafed to Moses of old from the heights of Sinai, a glimpse into the promised land, a foretaste of that precious treasure of civil and political rights, which, in the Providence of God and under the auspices of English rule, is to be the destined heritage of their nation. As for the rest they must possess their souls in patience, supported by the undying faith that their cause, based upon the highest justice, must eventually triumph. 'A man with a conviction,' says John Stuart Mill in his Essay on Representative Government 'is equal to ninety-nine without one.' The man of earnest faith is

irresistible and all-conquering. We Congressmen know what we are about ; we know our minds, we know our methods ; we stick to them with resolute tenacity of purpose—with a faith which, so far as some of us are concerned, I will say, does not belong to the things of this world. And who will say that the future is not ours?

We feel that in this great struggle in which we are engaged, the moral sympathies of civilised humanity are with us. The prayers of the good and the true in all parts of the world follow us. They will welcome as glad tidings of great joy the birth of an emancipated people on the banks of the Ganges. For have they not all read about our ancient civilization; how, in the morning of the world, before the Eternal City had been built upon the Seven Hills, before Alexander had marched his army to the banks of the Tigris, before Babylonian astronomers had learnt to gaze upon the starry world, our ancestors had developed a great civilization, and how that civilization has profoundly influenced the course of modern thought in the highest concerns of man? Above all, we rely with unbounded confidence on the justice and generosity of the British people and of their representatives in Parliament.

It is not that we mistrust the authorities here. But the higher we mount, the purer is the atmosphere. The impurities generated by local causes cannot touch those, who removed from local influences, represent in a loftier sphere of responsibility the majesty and the greatness of the English nation. Let us freely acknowledge the tribute we owe to the British Government in India. What Government could have accorded a speedier recognition to Congress claims than the Government of India has done? Within the life-time of a generation we have achieved changes—beneficent changes of far-reaching moment—which it would have taken many generations to accomplish elsewhere, which in less fortunately situated countries could not have been accomplished except, perhaps, after bloodshed and tumult. All this we freely acknowledge. For all this we are truly grateful. All this fills with hope for the future.

Nevertheless we feel that much yet remains to be done, and the impetus must come from England. To England we look for inspiration and guidance. To England we look for sympathy in the struggle. From England must come the crowning mandate which will enfranchise our peoples. England is our political guide and our moral preceptor in the exalted sphere of political duty. English history has taught us those principles of freedom which we cherish with our life-blood. We have been fed upon the strong food of English constitutional freedom. We have been taught to admire the eloquence and genius of the great masters of English political philosophy. We have been brought face to face with the struggles and the triumphs of the English people in their stately march towards constitutional freedom. Where will you find better models of courage, devotion, and sacrifice; not in Rome, not in Greece, not even in France in the stormy days of the Revolution—courage tempered by caution, enthusiasm leavened by sobriety, partisanship softened by a large-hearted charity—all subordinated to the one predominating sense of love of country and love of God.

We should be unworthy of ourselves and of our preceptors—we should, indeed, be something less than human—if, with our souls stirred to their inmost depths, our warm Oriental sensibilities roused to an unwonted pitch of enthusiasm by the contemplation of these great ideals of public duty, we did not seek to transplant into our own country the spirit of those free institutions which have made England what she is. In the words of Lord Lansdowne, a wave of unrest is passing through this country. But it is not the unrest of discontent or disloyalty to the British Government—it is the unrest which is the first visible sign of the awakening of a new national life. It is the work of Englishmen—it is the noblest monument of their rule—it is the visible embodiment of the vast moral influence which they are exercising over the minds of the people of India. Never in the history of the world have the inheritors of an ancient civilization been so profoundly influenced by the influx of modern ideas. In this Congress from year to year we ask England to accomplish her glorious work. The course of civilization following the path of the sun has travelled from East to West. The West owes a heavy debt to the East. We look forward to the day when that debt will be repaid, not only by the moral regeneration, but by the political enfranchisement of our people.

In our efforts for the improvement of our political status we feel that we may appeal with confidence to the sympathies of the Anglo-Indian community. They are Englishmen. By instinct and by tradition they are the friends of freedom. In regard to many, their interests in the country are permanent. In regard to many more, in view of the falling exchange, they are looking forward to making India their permanent home. Burke's well-known aphorism of the Anglo-Indians of his day being "birds of prey and passage" is well-nigh an extinct tradition. Our interests and their interests are identical. Their political status is not a whit removed from ours. If they have more influence in the Government, it is due to sufferance. They cannot claim it as a matter of right. Any extension of our political privileges would benefit them as well as ourselves. Difference there will always be between different sections of the same community, as there is in this country between zemindars and ryots; as there is in European countries between capitalists and labourers. But we are essentially members of the same community, in the sense that we have common rights and common grievances, and that it is our duty to stand shoulder to shoulder to remedy our grievances and to promote our rights. We are all interested in the development of our manufactures, and we all know what pressure is brought to bear upon the Government here—sometimes masked under the guise of philanthropy, sometimes less thinly veiled—to interfere with the growth of our manufacturing industries. Here, as in other matters, united we stand, divided we fall.

There is another agency—impalpable and invisible, noiselessly advancing onwards amid the din of our strifes towards the accomplishment of its own hidden purposes—which is helping us in this onward struggle. That agency is time. Time is with us—Time, present and future, is our ally. "Truth," says the Latin

proverb, "is the daughter of Time." We rely upon the beneficent forces of the Unseen Time. I know not whether there ever was a golden age in the past. It is a beautiful tradition. It embalms the ever-present sense of dissatisfaction which humanity feels with the present. Dissatisfaction is the parent of all progress. It stirs us on to ceaseless activity for the betterment of our race. A golden age is, indeed, looming in the future. There is a golden age in store for us and our children. It is this feeling which reconciles us to the present. We feel that if political freedom, in the sense in which it is enjoyed by British subjects elsewhere, is not to be our lot, it will be the inheritance of those who, coming after us, will bear our names and carry on our work. In that faith we work. In that faith we ask others to work. It is the faith which is the cement of the Congress movement. It implies confidence in the progressive character of British rule. It implies confidence in ourselves. Let it not be said that this confidence is misplaced. Let it not be said that the enthusiasm which animated us in the first days of the Congress movement is on the wane. The past ought to encourage us. The future ought to stir us into enthusiasm. The noblest heritage which we can leave to our children and our children's children is the heritage of enlarged rights, safe-guarded by the loyal devotion and the fervent enthusiasm of an emancipated people. Let us so work with confidence in each other, with unwavering loyalty to the British connection, that we may accomplish this great object within a measurable distance of time. Then will the Congress have fulfilled its mission—justified the hopes of those who founded it, and who worked for it—not, indeed, by the supersession of British rule in India, but by broadening its basis, liberalizing its spirit, ennobling its character, and placing it upon the unchangeable foundations of a nation's affections. It is not severance that we look forward to—but unification, permanent embodiment as an integral part of that great Empire which has given the rest of the world the models of free institutions—that is what we aim at. But permanence means assimilation, incorporation, equal rights, equal privileges. Permanence is incompatible with any form of military despotism, which is a temporary makeshift adapted to a temporary purpose. England is the august mother of free nations. She has covered the world with free States. Places, hitherto the chosen abode of barbarism, are now the home of freedom. Wherever floats the flag of England, there free Governments have been established. We appeal to England gradually to change the character of her rule in India, to liberalise it, to shift its foundations, to adapt it to the newly-developed environments of the country and the people, so that, in the fulness of time, India may find its place in the great confederacy of free States, English in their origin, English in their character, English in their institutions, rejoicing in their permanent and indissoluble union with England, a glory to the mother-country, and an honour to the human race. Then will England have fulfilled her great mission in the East, accomplished her high destiny among nations, repaid the long-standing debt which the West owes to the East, and covered herself with imperishable renown and everlasting glory. (*Loud and long continued Cheers.*)

Twelfth Congress—Calcutta—1896.

Hon. Mr. R. M. SAYANI.

I beg to thank you most heartily for the great honor you have conferred upon me by electing me President of this your Twelfth Congress. It is the highest honor which my fellow-countrymen can bestow upon me. I am aware that is also an honor which carries with it a serious responsibility, as it is by no means a light task to guide the deliberations of so large, so varied and so distinguished an assembly, representing as it does all that is loyal and patriotic, enlightened and influential, progressive and disinterested, in the country. I am further conscious of the fact that the position to which you have elected me has been invariably occupied in the past by extremely able leaders enjoying the full confidence of the people at large, and that under any circumstances, it will be beyond my power to come up to the standard of my immediate predecessor in this chair, who is so well known as one of the brightest ornaments of the country generally and especially of the province of Bengal. Relying, however, upon merciful Providence and on your indulgence and forbearance as also on your sympathy and support, I hope I may be able to discharge the duty you have entrusted me with to your satisfaction.

Some time prior to the Christian year 1885, certain Indian gentlemen who had received their education in the English language and been trained to English methods, and who had moreover derived their ideals of political institutions from English philosophers and statesmen, met together to deliberate amongst themselves on the advisability of convening a meeting of some of the most enlightened men of each province for the purpose of discussing the moral and material condition of the country and taking practical steps for its amelioration. A meeting was accordingly resolved upon; and as its conveners were God-fearing, law-abiding, peace-loving and peaceful subjects, distinguished for their independence, for the purity of their public lives, for the honesty of their purpose and for their political sagacity, their invitation was largely and cordially responded to. The meeting was attended by delegates deputed from each province and by some Europeans who warmly sympathised with the object. The discussion unmistakably emphasised the fact that there was a general consensus of opinion amongst the educated Indians that the existing political condition of the country was susceptible of a vast improvement. Then there was no doubt that the people had well-founded grievances which required to be redressed and serious disabilities which needed removal. All were agreed that, in order to achieve those objects, so conducive to the greater happiness and contentment of the people, it was advisable to adopt all legitimate and constitutional means and proceed on the methods employed by Englishmen themselves for agitation, that if agitation was carried on on such principles, never mind however long, there was a fair and reasonable chance

of success, especially with the co-operation of such Europeans as were ready and willing to extend their sympathy and moral support to a movement so legitimate and national. It was accordingly decided that a Congress should be held of all educated and eminent Indians, leaders of various centres, and all admirers of the political institutions of England, with the express purpose of appealing to Government to redress grievances and remove disabilities from which the people suffered, and to secure such other reforms as the exigencies of the time and the progress of the country demanded, consistently of course with the liberal principles and the declared policy of the British Government as laid down years ago in statutes and charters, in Royal proclamations, and resolutions of Parliament. Accordingly, the necessary steps for organizing such a Congress were taken. The principal promoters of that organisation were themselves the products of English education, while the persons invited to attend from the different Presidencies and Provinces were similarly the products of that same vivifying agency. There was also the facility of travel on account of the rapidity and cheapness of communication, the result of railways, one of the most important boons which English civilisation has conferred on our country. There was also the security to person and property assured by the Pax Britannica. Thus the call to attend fell upon willing ears and the invitees readily complied. All the elements necessary to secure a full attendance were combined, leading to cordial co-operation in the noble work thus initiated. In short, the country was ripe for the movement, so that delegates from the principal centres eagerly flocked to give expression to the "sober second thoughts of the people." They were all responsible citizens assembled to focus the manifold political grievances of the people and give them their needed articulation. For the first time they met on a common platform to achieve a common object, namely, to represent in the name of their countrymen the grievances under which they suffered and to give voice to their political sentiment and aspirations. They keenly felt the desire for wholesome reform and discussed with freedom and candour their political condition which they considered to be degrading. Their intellectual attainments recoiled against what they considered to be political subservience; their educated notions revolted against political disabilities; and their hearts aspired to attain a higher national ideal of citizenship under the beneficent rule of the British which they fully appreciated. It was an ideal worthy to be encouraged and fostered by all right-minded and justice-loving Englishmen, and took complete hold of them. The habitual lethargy of the Indian disappeared under the potent influence of this new and lofty standard of political regeneration. Ideas of a fair share in the management of the affairs of their own country and the enjoyment of greater constitutional freedom pervaded all minds. It was not a mere sentimental cooing between loving cousins nor a mere stage-show got up for the amusement of the public at Christmas time, but a very serious organisation of combined intellectual strength, intended for the discussion of very serious matters. Surely they thought,

and thought honestly, they were not mere theorists or sentimental dreamers, but intelligent, loyal, patriotic, well meaning, public-spirited men, representing the collective wisdom and ability of what was soon to become a United India. Feelings of sympathy and brotherhood pervaded the members, and every one was prepared to give anxious thought and patient consideration to what each other had to advance and urge. They felt that the Congress was but the first rich harvest of what had been sown long before by wise and beneficent British statesmen in the shape of Schools and Colleges. They further felt that the Congress was but the visible embodiment of a new education and a new awakening such as the country had not seen for some centuries before—the strong impact of Western civilisation on Eastern thought. In fact, they felt that there could be no doubt of the strength and depth of this awakening having national regeneration as its ultimate aim and object. They felt that their object was rational and practical— that under the vivifying influence of the Congress, all the various peoples of the country could slowly and steadily be welded into one inseparable, indissoluble whole, to the everlasting benefit of India and the glory of England, and that those who attended them as members of the first Congress would in the fulness of time be recognised as the great pioneers of the movement.

The following is a brief analysis of the declarations of the Congress leaders :—

(*a*) To remember that we are all children of our mother-country, India, and that as such we are bound to love and respect each other and have common fellow-feeling for each other, and that each one of us should regard as his own the interests of the rest of us.

(*b*) That we should endeavour to promote personal intimacy and friendship amongst all the great communities of India, to develop and consolidate sentiments of national growth and unity, to weld them together into one nationality, to effect a moral union amongst them, to remove the taunt that we are not a nation, but only a congeries of races and creeds which have no cohesion in them, and to bring about stronger and stronger friendly ties of common nationality.

(*c*) That we should endeavour specially to promote personal intimacy and friendship amongst all the earnest workers in the cause of India, to eradicate by direct friendly personal intercourse, all possible racial or provincial prejudices amongst all lovers of India, and to develop and consolidate sentiments of national unity, to effect a moral union amongst them which may stand as a solid bulwark against all external elements likely to divide or separate.

(*d*) That we should work together for our common elevation ; that we should work in the spirit that we are Indians and owe a duty to our country and to all our countrymen ; that we should all work with a singleness of purpose for the amelioration of our country.

(*e*) That in carrying out our work, we should take care that no questions should be decided without full previous preparation and detailed discussion of it all over the country ; that no point should be pressed unless there prevails an absolute

or an almost absolute unanimity of opinion amongst the thinking and educated classes of our countrymen.

(*f*) That we should confine our attention to those questions only in which the entire nation has a direct participation; that we should pass only such resolutions as are not the issue of the brain of a single individual but are the result of the best thoughts of many minds during a long period; that we should give due deference to the views and feelings of each other amongst the whole people of our country; that we should deal with those questions alone on which the whole of the educated and thinking portion of British India is substantially agreed.

(*g*) That we should conduct our proceedings with moderation and dignity so as to disarm all adverse criticism; that every member should be afforded an opportunity of maturely and gravely considering each question in all its bearings; that we should conduct our proceedings in such a way that whenever any resolution or decision has been come to, it should proceed from the Congress with authority and be received outside with respect; that we should conduct our proceedings in such a way that we may acquire and maintain a character for moderation, sagacity, and practical good sense; that we should be moderate in our language and in our demands; that we should remember that it is only by patience, perseverance, and long effort that we can hope to succeed.

(*h*) That we should remember that right and truth must ever prevail in the end; that it is not by violence or by noise that great things are achieved, nor by ambition or self-seeking; that it is by calm, indomitable reliance on that moral force, which is the supreme reason, that a nation's life can be regenerated; that we should avoid taking jumps into the unknown.

(*i*) That the best interests of the Indian tax-payer lie in peace, economy and reform; that his motto should be peace, loyalty, and progress. That the first most essential requisite for his happiness is the assurance of permanent peace and the rigid maintenance of law and order.

(*j*) That our business is to represent to Government our reasonable grievances and our political disabilities and aspirations.

The following is a brief summary of the subjects discussed by the various Congresses held up to date :—Working of Indian Administration. The Council of the Secretary of State for India, Legislative Councils, Simultaneous Examinations, Annexation of Upper Burma, Poverty of India, Public Service, Trial by Jury, Separation of Executive and Judicial Functions, Volunteering, Education, Industrial Condition of India, Arms Act, Police Administration, Abkari, State Regulation of Vice, Permanent Settlement, Plate Duties, Salt Duty, Forest Laws, Currency, Military and Civil Expenditure, Medical Service, Compensation Allowance, Forced Labor, Cotton Duty, Financial Condition of India, Recruitment of Higher Judical Service, Freedom of the Press, Water Cess, South Africa, Legal Practitioners' Bill, and Grievances of Railway Passengers.

The following are the places where the Congress has held its sittings :—

Bombay	..	(twice)
Calcutta	..	(twice)
Madras	..	(twice)
Allahabad	..	(twice)
Nagpur	..	(once)
Lahore	..	(once)
Poona	..	(once)

The following are the names of the gentlemen who have presided at Congress Meetings:—

Mr. W. C. Bonnerjee	..	(twice)
Mr. Dadabhai Naoroji	..	(twice)
Mr. Budrudin Tyabjee	..	(once)
Mr. George Yule	..	(once)
Sir W. Wedderburn Bart.	..	(once)
Mr. P. M. Mehta	..	(once)
Mr. P. Ananda Charlu	..	(once)
Mr. Alfred Webb	..	(once)
Mr. Surendranath Bannerjee	..	(once)

From the brief outlines of the history of the origin of the Congress herein given, of the declarations of its leaders, of the subjects it has discussed, of the places in which it has held its sittings, and of the persons who have presided over its deliberations, it is clear that the Congress was the direct outcome of the noble policy of England in introducing English education in India, and diffusing knowledge over the length and breadth of this country by means of schools and colleges and thus awakening the rising young men of our country to a sense of the duties they owed to themselves, to their neighbours, and to their countrymen generally. That although most of these young men had not travelled to Europe nor even crossed the ocean that separates their country from the rest of the world, indeed some of them had hardly travelled in their own country, and a few of them had never left even the confines of the towns which had given them birth, all of them had by studying all that is best and ennobling in English literature and freely conversing with noble-minded Englishmen, acquired a knowledge of the events that had happened and were happening in Europe, and especially in England, that thrice happy island, the home of liberty and progress. They had amongst other things learnt how the existing political institutions of England had obtained their present form; how English patriots, through adverse circumstances, had, by never-failing courage and indomitable perseverance, acquired one after another, their present privileges of liberty of thought and freedom of action both in the field of religion and politics. We all know how in ancient times noble persons who resolved to devote their lives to the beautifying of their mother cities, used to travel far and wide, and in their extensive travels used to come across the beauties of other cities, and from such beauties to form general

notions of beauty, and how, on their return to their native cities, used to endeavour to beautify their own cities in accordance with the notions of beauty thus formed by them. In a similar manner our educated young men, whilst mentally travelling through the realms of the History of Europe generally, and particularly the History of England, had their attention drawn to the political history of England, and thus acquired ideas of liberty, which, in course of time, they thought of applying to their own country. In short, they became anxious to regenerate the political condition of India. They felt, however, that the vast majority of their own countrymen, among whom higher education had not yet permeated, would at first give them no support but rather ridicule, and would obstruct them. At the same time they anticipated that the ruling class might misunderstand them. They felt they had serious difficulties to contend with in the initial stage. Misrepresentation and misunderstanding are elements which every new movement has to combat with. They resolved, therefore, to be cautious and circumspect, and at every step to feel the ground before they actually put their foot thereon. They were, of course, prepared to face adverse and hostile criticism, obloquy and accusations. The English martyrs, they knew, had undergone all this, nay, even suffered tortures and death. But our young men felt they had certain advantages which English martyrs had not. The Government had educated them, had in a manner sown the seeds of and fostered their new ideas. Some Englishmen themselves sympathised with them. Under the ægis of English Rule they had toleration, and, believing in their new faith and resolved to go through all trials, all struggles, all vicissitudes, they started to put their ideas into execution.

The origin of the Congress was thus an epoch in the history of the country, and with the establishment of the Congress began a new era in the political history of India, and during the years that have followed, the movement has extended from a comparatively few persons to the whole of the educated classes and has already begun to agitate the masses, and if it is guided in the future, as it has been guided in the past, by moderation, prudence, and sagacity, is bound to have a decisive influence on the destinies of British India for the good of the country and for the glory of England. The Congress is now favoured with the presence of about two thousand members from as many hundred places, all speaking the "sober second thoughts" of the people and counting amongst them the foremost leaders of opinion in the country, and all the culture, the intelligence, and the public spirit—indeed, the collective wisdom of the united, educated, and thinking portion of British India. It holds its sittings in the most important cities in the empire, under the presidency of the most prominent Indians of the day as well as of Englishmen of the genuine sympathy of the late Mr. George Yule, Sir William Wedderburn, and Mr. Alfred Webb.

The first President of the Congress was an able representative of Bengal, Mr. W. C. Bonnerji, an able and experienced member of our legal profession (who is known to have more than once refused a High Court Judgeship) whose devotion to his country is well-known.

The second President was my fellow-citizen, Mr. Dadabhai Naoroji, whose invaluable and disinterested services to his country for nearly half a century, not forgetting the work recently done in Parliament, are now matter of history. In fact, he may be said to be the principal maker of the political history of the country.

The third President was my honored and distinguished co-religionist, Mr. Justice Budrudin Tyabji, an educated and cultured Mussulman of catholic views.

The fourth President was the late Mr. George Yule, a distinguished Anglo-Indian merchant, who had taken a deep interest in the welfare of this country and its people.

The fifth President was again an Anglo-Indian, a member of the Indian Civil Service, a distinguished champion of the Congress movement, Sir W. Wedderburn, Baronet, M.P., who has worked both in and out of Parliament with a devotion which has commanded the admiration of all India.

The sixth President was my valued friend, Mr. P. M. Mehta, one of the most enthusiastic and devoted adherents of the cause of India, whose record of services for the last thirty years is one of which every one of my countrymen ought to be proud.

The seventh President was Rai Bahadur P. Anandacharlu, a distinguished representative from Madras, an eminent leader in his own Presidency.

The eighth President was again Mr. W. C. Bonnerji, of whom I have already spoken.

The ninth President was again Mr. Dadabhai Naoroji, the self-denying, unique patriot of India, whose advent to Lahore was the cause of those unparalleled demonstrations which are already historical.

The tenth President, Mr. Webb, was a warm-hearted and reflective Irish Member of Parliament in deep sympathy with our aspirations.

The eleventh President was the Hon. Surendranath Bannerji, whom I have already referred to. This brief record shows the cosmopolitan character of this great movement. It also indicates how representative it has been of all the communities of this great empire, Hindus, Mahomedans, Parsis and Anglo-Indians. Their addresses prove that the Congress is not a party organisation or a political caucus, but an assembly representative of the light and leading of this vast Empire, dealing with public matters and serving public interests generally in a broad and catholic spirit, with the view not of supplanting as is often erroneously and absurdly alleged, but of supporting the Government of this country.

The only communities that remain yet unhonoured in this matter are the Eurasians, the Portuguese, and the Jews. It is not, I presume, from any lack of desire on the part of this Congress that they have not yet been honored with the election of one of them as President, but because the communities are small, and it is difficult to find from them representative men. In the case of the Eurasians, this opportunity would have been gladly availed of had not the late Mr. D. S. White, the President of the Eurasian Association, been

snatched away from us by the cruel hand of death soon after the date of the first Congress held in Bombay, at which he was present. I hope, and this assembly will, I trust, share my hope, that these communities also will have their turn in proper time.

With a record of such illustrious Presidents before me, and coming, as I had to do immediately after one of the most eloquent modern Indian orators and leading spirits of the wealthy and educated province of Bengal, I naturally felt diffident of my ability to discharge the onerous and responsible duties devolving upon the occupant of this chair, but counting, as I have already stated, upon your indulgence, forbearance, and generosity, your sympathy and support, I consented to preside, resolved to follow the example of my esteemed friend Mr. Justice Budrudin Tyabji, who has had the benefit of eight years' residence in England, is a gentleman of manifold experience, moderate and considerate views on public affairs, and who has been eminently successful, but is nevertheless an orthodox Mussulman commanding the confidence and respect of his co-religionists. The one great object-lesson which his example teaches, is, that Mussulmans, with benefit to themselves, and consistently with Mussulman interests,—even assuming the Mussulman interests, as unthinkingly alleged, are in conflict with interests of the rest of the Indians,—can and ought to take part in this national movement.

I now proceed to point out how far in unison with the declared policy of Great Britain and British statesmen is the programme of the Indian National Congress. From the following few extracts it will be seen that the Congress is doing nothing but nobly endeavouring to practically pursue the very policy which the statesmen whose views I give in these extracts, laid down for the better Government of India during the best part of the present century.

Sir John Shore, in 1787: "Whatever allowance we may make for the increased industry of the subjects of the State, owing to the enhanced demand for the produce of it (supposing the demand to be enhanced), there is reason to conclude that the benefits are more than counterbalanced by evils inseparable from the system of a remote foreign dominion."

Mr. Charles Grant, in 1792: "Whatever diversity of opinion may have prevailed respecting the past conduct of the English in the East, all parties will concur in one sentiment that we ought to study the happiness of the vast body of subjects which we have acquired there. Upon this proposition taken as a truth of the highest sincerity and importance, the following observations. . . . . . . are founded. . . . . . . Although in theory it never can have been denied that the welfare of our Asiatic subjects ought to be the object of our solicitude, yet, in practice, this acknowledged truth has been but slowly followed up. . . . . . . Of late undoubtedly much has been done, and excellently done, to improve the condition of our subjects in the East, yet, upon an attentive examination, it may perhaps be found, that much yet remains to be performed." Amongst measures of improvement, Mr. Grant advocates that no force but reason should be employed; that knowledge should be communicated to the natives of India through the medium of the

English language; extension of printing for dissemination of English ideas; enlightening Indians by promoting mechanical industry; improvement in agriculture by introduction of machinery.

The Act of 1813: "That is the duty of this country to promote the interest and happiness of the native inhabitants of the British Dominions in India, and such means ought to be adopted as may tend to the introduction among them of useful knowledge and of religious and moral improvement, and in furtherance of the above objects sufficient facilities ought to be afforded by law to persons desirous of going to and remaining in India for the purpose of accomplishing the benevolent designs, so as the authority of the local Governments respecting the intercourse of the Europeans, with the interior of the country be preserved, and the principles of the British Government on which the natives of India have hitherto relied for the free exercise of their religion be unavoidably maintained."

By clause 43 of this Act it was ordered that the sum of £10,000 should be appropriated to the education of the natives in all the three Presidencies. This was the *first* statutory declaration enjoining on the East India Company to spend a lakh of rupees on education. The sum, however, was not spent till 1824, which is the first year in which the State spent some money on education.

On the 2nd October, 1815, Lord Moira issued a minute declaring his solicitude for the moral and intellectual condition of the natives and his anxiety to see established and maintained some system of public education.

In 1817 Lord Hastings announced that the Government in India did not consider it necessary to keep the natives in a state of ignorance in order to retain its own power; consequent on this announcement the Calcutta Text-book Society and the Hindu College were immediately founded.

Elphinstone, in 1823:—"It is difficult to imagine an undertaking in which our duty, our interest and our honour are more immediately concerned. It is now well understood that in all countries the happiness of the poor depends in a great measure on their education. It is by means of it alone that they can acquire those habits of prudence and self-reliance from which all other good qualities spring, and if ever there was a country where such habits are required, it is this. We have all often heard of the ills of early marriages and overflowing population, of the savings of a life squandered on some one occasion of festivity, of the helplessness of the ryots which renders them a prey to money-lenders, of their indifference to good clothes or houses which has been used on some occasions as an argument against lowering the public demands on them, and finally of the vanity of the laws to protect them when no individual can be found who had spirit enough to take advantage of those enacted in their favour; there is but one remedy for all this, which is education. If there be a wish to contribute to the abolition of the horrors of self-immolation and of infanticide, and ultimately to the destruction of superstition in India, it is scarcely necessary now to prove that the only means of success lie in the diffusion of knowledge."

Sir John Malcolm in 1828:—"One of the chief objects, I expect from diffusing

education among the natives of India, is our increased power of associating them in every part of the administration. This I deem essential on grounds of economy, of improvement, and of security. I further look to the employment of the natives in such duties of trust and responsibility as the only mode in which we can promote their improvement; and I must deem the instruction we are giving them dangerous, instead of useful, unless the road is opened wide to those who receive it to every prospect of honest ambition and honorable distinction."

The Court of Directors in 1830:—"In the meantime we wish you to be fully assured, not only of our anxiety that the Judicial offices to which natives are at present eligible should be properly filled, but of our earnest wish and hope to see them qualified for situations of higher importance and trust. There is no point of view in which we look with greater interest at the exertions you are now making for the instruction of the natives than as being calculated to raise up a class of persons qualified, by their intelligence and morality, for high employments in the Civil administration of India. As the means of bringing about this most desirable object, we rely chiefly on their becoming, through a familiarity with European literature and science, imbued with the ideas and feelings of civilized Europe, on the general cultivation of their understandings, and specifically on their instruction in the principles of morals and general jurisprudence. We wish you to consider this as our deliberate view of the scope and end to which all our endeavours with respect to the education of the natives should refer. And the active spirit of benevolence, guided by judgment, which has hitherto characterized your exertions, assures us of your ready and zealous co-operation towards an end which we have so deeply at heart.

"The improvements in education however which most effectually contribute to elevate the moral and intellectual condition of a people, are those which concern the education of the higher classes, of the persons possessing leisure and important influence over the minds of their countrymen. By raising the standard of instruction among the classes you would eventually produce a much greater and more beneficial change in the ideas and feelings of the community than you can hope to produce by acting directly on the more numerous class.

"You are, moreover, acquainted with our anxious desire to have at our disposal a body of natives qualified by their habits and acquirements to take a large share and occupy higher situations in the Civil Administration of their country than has hitherto been the practice under our Indian Governments."

Lord Macaulay in 1831:—"It would be far better for us that the people of India were well-governed and independent of us than ill-governed and subject to us; that they were ruled by their own kings and wearing our broadcloth, and working with our cutlery, than that they were performing their salaams to English Collectors and English Magistrates, but were too ignorant to value, or too poor to buy, English manufactures. To trade with civilized men is infinitely more profitable than to govern savages. That would indeed be a doting wisdom which would keep a hundred millions of men

from being our customers in order that they might continue to be our slaves."

Mr. Charles Grant in 1833:—Resolution moved by him in the House of Commons:—

"That it is expedient that the Government of the British possessions in India be entrusted to the said company under such conditions and regulations as Parliament shall enact, for the purpose of extending the commerce of this country and of securing the good government and promoting the religious and moral improvement of the people of India."

The Act of 1833:—"That no native of the said territories (India) nor any natural born subject of His Majesty resident therein shall by reason only of his religion, place of birth, descent, color, or any of them be disabled from holding any place office, or any employment under the said Government." That the policy of British Rule in India should be a policy of justice and advancement of the people. India was to be regarded as a Trust placed by God in the hands of Englishmen and they would follow the "plain path of duty."

1835:—Free press was conceded.

Mr. Gladstone:—"It will not do for us to treat with contempt or even with indifference the rising aspirations of this great people."

Lord Roberts:—"Our greatest strength must ever rest on the firm base of a united and a contented India."

Lord Northbrook in 1874:—"There is one simple test which we may apply to all Indian questions; let us never forget that it is our duty to govern India, not for our own profit and advantage, but for the benefit of the natives of India."

Lord Lytton in 1877:—"But you the natives of India, whatever your race and whatever your creed, have a recognised claim to share largely with your English fellow subjects, according to your capacity for the task, in the administration of the country you inhabit. This claim is founded in the highest justice. It has been repeatedly affirmed by British and Indian statesmen and by the legislation of the Imperial Parliament. It is recognised by the Government of India as binding on its honor and consistent with the aims of its policy."

Lord Ripon in 1882:—"The document (Her Majesty's Proclamation) is not a treaty, it is not a diplomatic instrument, it is a declaration of principles of Government, which, if it is obligatory at all, is obligatory in respect to all to whom it is addressed. The doctrine, therefore, to which Sir Fitz-James Stephen has given the sanction of his authority, I feel bound to repudiate to the utmost of my power. It seems to me to be inconsistent with the character of my Sovereign and with the honor of my country, and if it were free to be received and acted upon by the Government of England it would do more harm than anything else could possibly do to strike at the very root of our power and to destroy our just influence, because that power and that influence rest upon the conviction of our good faith more than upon any other foundation, aye, more than upon the valour of our soldiers and the reputation of our armies."

"My study of History has led me to the conclusion that it is not by force of her armies or by the might of her soldiery that a great empire is permanently maintained, but it is by the righteousness of her laws, by her respect for the principles of her justice."

Lord Dufferin in 1887:—"Glad and happy should I be if, during my sojourn among them (the people of India), circumstances permitted me to extend and to place upon a wider and more logical footing the political status which was so wisely given, a generation ago, by that great statesman, Lord Halifax, to such Indian gentlemen, as by their influence, by their acquirements and the confidence they inspired in their fellow countrymen, were marked out as useful adjuncts to our Legislative Councils."

The principles of policy, which may be deduced from the above extracts are—

(*a*) That it is the duty of England to study the interest, the happiness and the welfare of the people of India.

(*b*) That it was not necessary to keep the people of India in a state of ignorance in order to retain the power of England over India.

(*c*) That the people of India should be educated. That this education should be given to them through the medium of the English language and that English ideas should be disseminated broadcast amongst them.

(*d*) That the people of India should be associated in the administration of the country and that every prospect of honest ambition and honorable distinction should be open to them.

(*e*) That all disabilities in regard to public employment should be removed.

(*f*) That the policy of British Rule in India should be a policy of justice, good faith and righteousness and of advancement of the people.

I now pass on to the gracious Proclamation of the Queen in 1858—a Proclamation which is rightly held to be the Magna Charta of the Indian people. It will be observed that it is to secure the fulfilment of the solemn pledges of the Proclamation that the Congress is strenuously endeavouring. It is because some of the pledges remain unfulfilled and others are violated that the Congress is obliged to appeal to our rulers. Let me now repeat some of the extracts.

"We hold ourselves bound to the natives of our Indian territories by the same obligations of duty which bind us to all our other subjects; and those obligations by the blessings of Almighty God, we shall faithfully and conscientiously fulfil."

"And it is our further wish, that, so far as may be, our subjects of whatever race or creed, be truly and impartially admitted to offices in our service, the duties of which they may be qualified by their education, ability and integrity to discharge."

This document is, as stated by Lord Ripon, a Declaration of Principles of Government. It is the Magna Charta of British India. It was not the result of agitation or even of petition. It was granted by the free will and pleasure of the Sovereign, and truly displays the generosity of the Royal nature. It was given after the suppression of the mutiny, and is a remarkable proof of the clemency of the British Crown. It is characteristic of the Noble Lady, the Mother of her subjects, whose reign has been an epoch in the history of the world. Deep reliance on merciful

Providence and true sincerity pervade the document. It is stated that this century, which is rapidly approaching its end, has been the humanitarian century *par excellence*, and has seen the end of many injustices and of many follies, that deserved to be wiped off the face of creation. But of all the mementoes of this humanitarian century, so far as India is concerned, the Proclamation will stand the highest and will be cherished the deepest and the longest by a grateful people.

It will be observed from the above extracts, both from the opinions of the English statesmen and from the proclamation, that the people of England, possessing, as they do, a genuine admiration for their own constitution, and jealous as they are for their own liberty, are not the people to view with disfavor the political aspirations of the people of India, aspirations forsooth, which the people of England themselves have deliberately inspired in the hearts of the people of India by purposely educating them in the English language by disseminating amongst them English ideals of political life and by encouraging them to raise themselves by education, intelligence and integrity, so as to become qualified to occupy positions of importance and trust in the service of the Government, as also to take part in the administration of the country. Under the circumstances those persons—and I regret to say some such do exist amongst my community—who imagine that the people of England are at heart against the people of India are certainly doing a great injustice to the people of England. It may be that such wrongheaded persons may have been led into committing the mistake by the insular rigidity of England and the stiff-and stand-off attitude of some Englishmen and their rough refusal at time to budge or bend an inch. But surely such persons should not be carried away by outward appearances or by false inferences derived from such outward appearances. If such people will go a little deeper into things, their minds will soon be disabused of these pure delusions. In fact, a more honest or sturdy nation does not exist under the sun than this English nation ; and there ought to be no doubt whatever as to the ultimate concession of our demands, founded, as such demands are, on reason and justice on the one hand, as on the declared policy and the plighted word of the people of England on the other—provided always that the people of India are true to themselves. I repeat that there can be no doubt whatever as to these reasonable demands being ultimately conceded.

Sir William Wilson Hunter, in his article dealing with "the effects of a strongly constructed and vigorously enforced system of Western instruction upon an Asiatic population," says " India is now going through a quicker and more striking metamorphosis. We sometimes hear its marvellous awakening compared to the renaissance of Europe four hundred years ago. But in India the change is not only taking place on a greater scale it also goes deeper. It derives its motive power, moreover, not from the individual impulse of isolated men of genius or of cultured popes and princes, but from the mighty centralising force of a Government which, as an engine of human unification, has had nothing to compare with it since the days of Imperial Rome. English rule in India is however calmly carrying out processes of consolidation that never entered the brain of Roman statesman or emperor. While maintaining a policy of cold non-interference towards the rival religions, the domestic institutions, and the local usages of the Indian peoples, it is silently undermining those

ancient separatist influences which made for the isolation of races. It has created a new nexus for the active intellectual elements in the population,—a nexus which is beginning to be recognised as a bond between man and man and between province and province, apart from the ties of religion, of geographical propinquity, or of caste, a nexus interwoven of three strong cords, a common language, common political aims, and a sense of the power of action in common, the products of a common system of education.

"I may therefore briefly say that those political movements are the legitimate and inevitable results of Western education in India. The men who conduct them are the men to whom in all other respects, intellectual and moral, we are accustomed to point as the highest products of British rule in India. They are the men who form the natural interpreters of our rule to the masses of the people. To speak of such men, when their activity takes a political direction as disaffected, would be equally unjust and untrue; for they are the men who, of all our Indian fellow-subjects, realise most clearly that their interests, present and future, are identified with the permanence of British rule.

"But brief as this survey has unavoidably been, it suffices to show that the present political movements among the Indian races are only one aspect of a general advance, moral, intellectual, and industrial, that is now going on. The most significant fact connected with the late Indian National Congress at Bombay was not its marvellous assemblage of 1889 representatives from every province of India. It was rather that this great gathering for political purposes was held side by side with a still greater meeting in the same city for ameliorating the condition of women in India, the Social Reform Conference, attended by 6,000 persons, chiefly Hindus. A political movement which is purely political—may be wise or unwise; but a political movement which forms part of the general advance of a people to a higher state of society and to a nobler ideal of domestic and individual life, is irresistible. It may be guided, it may be moderated, but it must assuredly be reckoned with."

At a meeting held on the 10th May 1866 at Aligarh, Syed Ahmed Khan, in a deliberate speech, said;—

"It is with great regret that we view the indifference and want of knowledge evinced by the people of India with regard to the British Parliament. Can you expect that body, Gentlemen, to take a deep interest in your affairs if you do not lay your affairs before it?......There are many men now composing it, liberal in their views, just and virtuous in their dealings, who take a deep interest in all that affects the welfare of the human race. To excite this interest however it is necessary that the requirements and wishes of that portion of mankind on whose behalf they are to exert themselves be made clearly known to them. Their interest and philanthropy once excited, you may feel assured, Gentlemen, that the wants, be the wants of the Jew, the Hindu, the Christian or the Mahomedan, of the black-man or of the white, will be attentively studied and duly cared for. India, with that slowness to avail herself of that which would benefit her.........so characteristic of Eastern races, has hitherto looked on Parliament with a dreamy, apathetic eye, content to have her affairs, in the shape of her budget brought before it in an annual and generally inaudible speech, by Her Majesty's Secretary of state for India. Is this state of things to continue, or has the time now come when the interests of this great dependency are to be properly represented in the governing body of the British nation? It has come, Gentlemen, and I entreat you to interest yourselves for your country. The European section of the community in India, now grown so large, have set on foot an association in London with branch associations in India, in order to have Indian affairs and the wants and desires of all classes of her inhabitants brought prominently to the notice of Parliament............but unles

the entire native community out here co-operate with them, place funds at their disposal, and take such measures as may conduce to place the scheme on a permanent basis, the opportunity wil be lost, the natives of India will be unrepresented, and you will only have yourselves to reproach when in after years you see the European section of the community enjoying their well-earned concessions, whilst your wants remain still unmet.

"I am afraid that a feeling of fear, that the Government or the district authorities would esteem you factious and discontented, were you to inaugurate a measure like this, deters you from coming forward for your country's good. Are the Europeans thought factious and discontented? Believe me, that this moral cowardice is wrong, this apprehension unfounded: and that there is not an Englishman of a liberal turn of mind in India who would regard with feelings other than those of pleasure and hope such a healthy sign of increased civilization on the part of its inhabitants. If you will only show yourselves possessed of zeal and self-reliance, you are far more likely to gain the esteem of an independent race like the English than if you remain, as you now are, apathetic and dependent. The actions and laws of every Government, even the wisest that ever existed, although done or enacted from the most upright and patriotic motives, have at times proved inconsistent with the requirements of the people or opposed to real justice. The natives have at present little or no voice in the management of the affairs of their country, and should any measure of Government prove obnoxious to them they brood over it, appearing outwardly satisfied and happy, whilst discontent is rankling in their minds. I hope you, my native hearers, will not be angry with me for speaking the truth. You know that you are in the habit of inveighing against various acts of Government in your own homes and amongst your own families, and that you, in the course of your visits to European gentlemen, represent yourselves as quite satisfied with the justice and wisdom of these very acts. Such a state of affairs is inimical to the well-being of the country. Far better would it be for India were her people to speak out openly and honestly their opinions as to the justice or otherwise of the acts of Government." Syed Ahmed Khan then quotes from Mr. John Stuart Mill the following passage: "The rights and interests of every or of any person are only secure from being disregarded when the person interested is himself able and habitually disposed to stand up for them. The second is that the general prosperity attains a greater height and is more widely diffused in proportion to the personal energies enlisted in promoting it." Syed Ahmed Khan then proceeds: "These principles, my friends, are as applicable to the people of India as they are to those of any other nation, and it is in your power, it now rests with you alone, to put them into practice. If you will not help yourselves, you may be quite certain no one else will. Why should you be afraid? Here am I, a servant of Government, speaking out plainly to you in this public meeting. My attachment to Government was proved, as many of you know, in the eventful year of the Mutiny. It is my firm conviction—one which I have invariably expressed, both in public and in private—that the greater the confidence of the people of India in the Government, the more solid the foundation upon which the present Government rests, and the more mutual friendship is cultivated between your rulers and yourselves, the greater will be the future benefit to your country. Be loyal in your hearts, place every reliance upon your rulers speak out openly, honestly, and respectfully all your grievances, hopes and fears, and you may be quite sure that such a course of conduct will place you in the enjoyment of all your legitimate rights, and that this is compatible, nay synonymous, with true loyalty to the State will be upheld by all whose opinion is worth hearing."

It is imagined by some persons that all, or almost all the Mussulmans of India, are against the Congress movement. That is not true. Indeed, by far the largest part do not know what the Congress movement is. Education of any sort or kind is

conspicuous by its absence amongst them, and their habitual apathy has kept them from understanding the movement at all. In fact they are blissfully ignorant. What the causes of such ignorance and apathy are, will be presently inquired into. It will be sufficient here to state that one infinitely small class of persons who have received liberal education through the medium of the English language, and another equally infinitely small class of persons who have received no education whatever through the medium of the English language, but who have acquired a smattering of what they are pleased to consider education, through the Hindustani language, have considered it a fashionable thing to abuse the Congress and Congressmen as such. There being thus two different classes of mal-contents, if they may be so called, the grounds of their opposition, are naturally different, nay even inconsistent, with each other. There is a third class, also a small one at present, who have recently risen from their apathy and are honestly endeavouring to educate themselves in the right direction and are destined soon to come to the front, and, it may safely be surmised, will become as enthusiastic supporters of the Congress movement as any; but with this last-mentioned class we have no immediate concern, and this address will confine itself to the two classes first mentioned. Before going, however, through the grounds of opposition on the part of these two classes it is desirable to revert to the causes of ignorance and apathy aforesaid. An advocate of the views of the first two classes might will be supposed, if he ever cared to put his views systematically, to place the case for the Mahomedans in the following way :—

Before the advent of the British in India, the Mussulmans were the rulers of the country. The Mussulmans had, therefore, all the advantages appertaining to the ruling class. The Sovereigns and the chiefs were their co-religionists, and so were the great landlords and the great officials. The court language was their own. Every place of trust and responsibility, or carrying influence and high emoluments was by birth-right theirs. The Hindu did occupy some positions, but the Hindu holders of position were but the tenants-at-will of the Mussulmans. The Mussulmans had complete access to the Sovereigns and to the chiefs. They could, and did, often eat at the same table with them. They could also, and often did, intermarry. The Hindus stood in awe of them. Enjoyment and influence and all the good things of the world were theirs. Into the best-regulated kingdoms, however, as into the best-regulated societies and families, misfortunes would intrude and misfortunes did intrude into this happy Mussulman rule. By a stroke of misfortune, the Mussulmans had to abdicate their position and descend to the level of their Hindu fellow-countrymen. The Hindus who had before stood in awe of their Mussulman masters were thus raised a step by the fall of their said masters and with their former awe dropped their courtesy also. The Mussulmans who are a very sensitive race, naturally resented the treatment and would have nothing to do either with their rulers or with their fellow-subjects. Meanwhile the noble policy of the new rulers of the country introduced English education into the country

The learning of an entirely unknown and foreign language, of course, required hard application and industry. The Hindus were accustomed to this, as even under the Mussulman rule, they had practically to master a foreign tongue, and so easily took to the new education. But the Mussulmans had not yet become accustomed to this sort of thing, and were, moreover, not then in a mood to learn, much less to learn anything that required hard work and application, especially as they had to work harder than their former subjects, the Hindus. Moreover, they resented competing with the Hindus, whom they had till recently regarded as their inferiors. The result was that so far as education was concerned, the Mussulmans who were once superior to the Hindus now actually became their inferiors. Of course, they grumbled and groaned, but the irony of fate was inexorable. The stern realities of life were stranger than fiction. The Mussulmans were gradually ousted from their lands, their offices ; in fact everything was lost save their honor. The Hindus, from a subservient state, came into the lands, offices and other wordly advantages of their former masters. Their exultation knew no bounds and they trod upon the heels of their former masters. The Mussulmans would have nothing to do with anything in which they might have to come into contact with the Hindus. They were soon reduced to a state of utter poverty. Ignorance and apathy seized hold of them while the fall of their former greatness rankled in their hearts. This represents the train of thought which pre-occupies the mind of many who would otherwise be well disposed towards this movement : all will admit that though they might object to particular statements, on the whole there is an element of truth which explains the Mahomedan depression.

"Almost everywhere" says Sir W. W. Hunter, "it was found that the Hindu population seized with avidity on the opportunities afforded by State education or bettering themselves in life ; while the Mahomedan community, excepting in certain localities, failed as a whole to do so. State education thus put the finishing stroke to the influence of the Mahomedans, as the former ruling race in India. That position they had inherited from the time of the Mogul Empire, and during the first period of the Company's administration they still held an undue proportion of official posts. In the last century Mussulman Collectors gathered the Company's land-tax in Bengal, Mussulman Foujdars and Ghatwals officered its police. A great Mussulman department, with its head-quarters in the Nawab Nizam's palace at Murshidabad, and a net-work of Mussulman officials over every district in Lower Bengal, administered the Criminal Law. Mussulman jailors kept ward over the prison population of Northern India ; Kazis or Mahomedan Doctors of law presided in the civil and domestic courts. When the Company first attempted to administer justice by means of trained English officers in its Bengal possessions, the Mahomedan Law Doctors still sat with them as their authoritative advisers on points of law. The Code of Islam remained for many purposes the law of the land, and the ministerial and subordinate offices of Government continued to be the almost hereditary property of the Mussalmans." But with the introduction of English education, " the Hindus began to pour into every grade

of official life; and the state system of education in 1854 completed the revolution." Teaching disappeared everywhere, even in the mosques. After the Mahomedan conquest of India the mosque had become "the centres of educational activity, and were supported by imperial or local grants of land." But the mosques now ceased teaching, even in Lower Bengal, the Province which, "a hundred years previously, was officered by a few Englishmen, a sprinkling of Hindus, and a multitude of Mahomedans." The Mussalmans lost all ground. . . .
. . . .

"It became apparent that western instruction was producing not only a redistribution of employments but also an upheaval of races."

The Government of India, that is, the English gentlemen, both in England and in India, directly concerned in carrying on the administration of India, became alarmed at this state of things. The English people, generally, were grieved at the mistaken, yet noble, race of Indian Mussulmans thus going fast to ruin. Despatch after despatch was sent to India to do something for the Mussulmans. Special facilities were ordered. Some Mussulmans were after all found willing to receive liberal education, and these in their turn organized themselves into a body to educate others, and thus arose the educated class of Mussulmans. Now, the Mussulmans are noted for their gratitude. Some persons seem to have put it into their heads that Government as a body disapproved of their subjects criticising the measures of the administration. Hence that educated class, honestly, though mistakenly, opposes the Congress movement. As to the second class, their interest lies in keeping the Mussulmans ignorant, so as to turn such ignorance and the consequent credulity to their own advantage.

The following appear to be the objections of the Mussulmans to the Congress:—

1. That it is against their religion to join the Congress, as by joining the Congress they will be joining the Hindus who are not Mussulmans.

2. That it is against their religion to join the Congress, as by joining the Congress they will be joining a movement opposed to Government, a thing which is opposed to their religion, which directs obedience and loyalty to Government, albeit Government may not be treating them properly.

3. That it is against their religion to learn the English language.

4. That the success of the Congress would weaken the British rule, and might eventually end in the overthrow of British power and the substitution of Hindu rule.

5. That Government is against the Congress movement; that in addition to the duty of loyalty, the Mussulmans owe the duty of gratitude to Government for giving them a liberal education; therefore by joining the Congress, the Mussulmans would be guilty of the sin of ingratitude towards Government.

6. That the Congress does not adequately represent all the races of India.

7. That the motives of the persons constituting the Congress are not honest.

8. That the aims and objects of the Congress are not practical.

9. That the Congress is not important enough to deal satisfactorily with the subjects it takes up.

10. That the modes of Government prevailing in the West, namely, examination, representation, and election, are not adapted to India.

11. That such modes are not adapted to Mussulmans.

12. That the result of the application of Western methods to India would be to place all offices under Government in the power of the Hindus, and the Mussulmans would be completely ousted from Government employment.

13. That Government employment should be conferred not on the test of examinations, but by selection on the ground of race, position of the family, and other social and local considerations.

14. That public distinctions, such as seats on the Legislative Councils, Municipal Boards, and other Public Bodies, should be conferred not by the test of election, but by nomination based on the ground of race, and social influence and importance.

15. That inasmuch as the Congress is a representative body, and inasmuch as the Hindus formed the majority of the population, the Congress will necessarily be swamped by the Hindus, and the resolutions of the Congress will, to all intents and purposes, be the resolutions of the Hindus, and the Mussulman's voice will be drowned, and, therefore, if the Mussulmans join the Congress they will not only not be heard, but will be actually assisting in supporting Hindus to pass resolutions against the interest of the Mussulmans, and to give color to such resolutions as the resolutions of Hindus and Mussulmans combined, and thus aiding in passing resolutions against themselves and misleading Government into believing that the Mussulmans are in favour of such resolutions.

16. That Mussulman boys have to learn the languages appertaining to their religion, before joining schools; they are, therefore, at a disadvantage in the start for English education as compared with the Hindus. That the result is, that the Hindus pass the examinations, and as Government employment is given upon the test of examinations, the Mussulmans are necessarily ousted from Government employment, and it follows that the test of examination is not a fair test.

17. That as employments are given on the test of examinations, the result is that Hindus get such employment, and even in districts where the majority of the population are Mussulmans, the Hindus form the subordinate officialdom. That the Hindus being hostile to the Mussulmans, lord it over them, and the Mussulmans are naturally grieved to be lorded over by the Hindus, that in many cases these Hindus are from the lower strata of society, and in that case they tyrannise the more and thus aggravate the harsh treatment of the Mussulmans. That the result is that the Mussalmans, and amongst them Mussulmans descended from royal and noble families, are mortified at being not only ruled over, but even molested by and tyrannised over, in all manner of ways by Hindus, and Hindus of the lowest orders.

I now proceed to answer these objections.

1. Mussulmans in the past—Mussulmans not in name only, but orthodox, true Mussulmans—constantly travelled in foreign lands and mixed with all the nations of the world. The Mussulmans in India are the descendants of the Mussulmans who thus travelled to and settled in India, and of the Hindus whom such Mussulmans converted to Islam. All the Mussulmans in India have always lived side by side with the Hindus and mixed with them and even co-operated with them, both during the period of the Mussulman rule, as also since then. In fact, both the Mussulmans and the Hindus, as also other races residing in this country, are all equally the inhabitants of one and the same country, and are thus bound to each other by ties of a common nativity. They are all sharers in the benefits and advantages, as also in the ills, consequent on common residence; and, so far as natural and climatic conditions are concerned, all the inhabitants, irrespective of all other considerations, are subject to common joys and common sorrows and must necessarily co-operate with each other, as humanity is imperfect and dependent on co-operation. Again, both the Mussulmans and the Hindus are subjects of the same sovereign and living under the protection of the same laws, and are equally affected by the same administration. The object of the Congress is to give expression to the political demands of the subject, and to pray that their political grievances may be redressed and their political disabilities may be removed; that the political burdens of the country may be lightened and its political conditions may be ameliorated; that the political status of millions of human beings who are their fellow-countrymen may be improved, and their general condition may be rendered more tolerable. It is a most meritorious work, a work of the highest charity. No nobler or more charitable work could possibly be conceived. The only question is whether there should be two separate organisations, Mussulman and non-Mussulman, both simultaneously doing the same work, separate in name, but identical in nature and interest; or whether there should be a joint organisation. Obviously, the latter is preferable, especially as the Congress has no concern whatever with the religion or the religious convictions of any of its members.

2. It is not true that the Congress movement is a movement in opposition to Government. It is a movement for the purpose of expressing the grievances of the subjects to Government in a legal and constitutional manner, and for the purpose of asking Government to fulfil promises made by Government, of its own free will and pleasure; in fact, it is the duty of all truly loyal subjects—subjects desirous of seeing the Government maintained in its power—to inform Government of their own wants and wishes as it is also the duty of Government to ascertain the wants and wishes of the subjects and, indeed, those subjects who will not keep the Government well informed of their own wants and wishes cannot be called true friends of Government. We are all aware that the English nation, our common fellow-subjects, always makes it a point to inform Government of its own wants and wishes, so that

Government may be able to fulfil such wants and wishes. In the case of India, moreover, promises have been made from time to time by Government to concede certain privileges ; indeed, we have the plighted word of our most Gracious Sovereign herself confirming those promises. It is our duty, therefore, to remind Government of such promises and to ask it to fulfil them.

3. Language is but the medium of expression. Orthodox and true Mussulmans have in their time learned the Greek, the Latin, and other languages. There is, therefore, nothing against learning any language. In fact, many Mussulmans of India, indeed, most of them, learn and speak languages other than the language of their religion. The objection, therefore, against learning the English language, which is moreover the language of our rulers, is so absurd on the face of it, that it need not be further adverted to.

4. The object of the Congress has already been stated. The success of the Congress, as has also been stated, instead of weakening Government, will only contribute towards the greater permanence of British rule in India. The Mussulmans, therefore, need not be frightened by phantoms created by their own imagination.

5. It is the duty of all good boys, who have by the liberal policy of their fathers been enabled to receive a liberal education, to repay the kindness of their fathers, by assisting their fathers in the management of their affairs with the aid of such education and by contributing to the maintenance and welfare of the family by all honest means in their power. Similarly, it is the duty of those subjects who have received a liberal education with the aid of Government, to repay the kindness of Government by assisting Government in the proper discharge of its high functions by informing Government of the shoals and rocks lying ahead in its path and thus enabling Government to steer clear of such shoals and rocks, and not to lie by quietly with a false sense of gratitude and leaving Government to run against such shoals and rocks and thus unintentionally, of course, but nevertheless contribute to its grounding ashore. True gratitude lies in true good wishes and true good assistance and not in false modesty and indolence.

6. If the Congress does not, as is alleged, adequately represent all the races, surely the fault lies, not on the shoulders of the Congress leaders who invite all the races, but on the shoulders of those races themselves who turn a deaf ear to such invitation, and prefer not to respond to it. It is the duty of such races, in response to such invitation, to attend the Congress and not to blame the Congress when, in fact, they ought to blame themselves.

7. All public bodies, assembled in public meetings, desirous of giving every publicity to their proceedings and even keeping a public record of its transactions, ought to be judged by their sayings and doings. It is not right or proper to attribute to such bodies improper motives, unless such motives can be fairly and reasonably inferred from their sayings or doings or both. In fact, no person, having any sense of self-respect, ought to attribute improper motives,

unless he is prepared to prove the same, and it is to be hoped, for the honor of the Mussulmans, to cease from making reckless charges which they are not prepared to substantiate.

8. As to the aims and objects of the Congress not being practical, it is a well-known fact that public attention has been drawn to the demands of the Congress, and not only the classes but even the masses have already been awakened to a sense of their political grievances and disabilities. Government has also been pleased to take into its favourable consideration the demands o the Congress, and has partially conceded the expansion of the Legislative Councils and introduced the element of election therein. Indeed, if the Congress movement is continued with the same ability, prudence and sagacity that have characterized it in the past, and especially if those who have hitherto contented themselves with simply throwing out objections begin in right earnest to take part in the movement, the movement is certain to bear fruit in the very near future and to end in practical results.

9. As to the Congress not being important enough to deal with the subjects it takes up, it will not be denied that the Congress contains in its ranks some of the most educated, most wealthy and most influential men of the day, some of whom have occupied—and occupied honorably—public offices of trust and importance, and most of whom are leaders of their respective centres. In fact, in the Congress camp one comes across legislators, municipal councillors, rich zamindars, extensive merchants, renowned lawyers, eminent doctors, experienced publicists, indeed, representatives of every industry and every profession in the land. In fact, it will be hard—nay impossible—to name any other non-official public body equally important with the Congress.

10. As to the modes of government prevailing in the West not being adapted to India, the position stands as follows: In a primary state of society, whilst a particular small nation, confined to a narrow strip of territory, is governed by a single ruler, who generally belongs to that nation and is residing in that territory, as the nation is not a numerous one and the territory not a large one, the ruler is necessarily in daily and constant touch with his subjects. The affairs of the State are of a very limited nature and do not occupy much time of the ruler. Moreover, there are not special or local circumstances of sufficient importance to be taken into consideration. The affairs of the State are of a simple nature. The offices are not many and do not require special merits for their proper performance. Whenever, therefore, the ruler has to appoint to a post, the ruler himself is qualified to do so. He does not find it necessary to resort to any complicated method for the performance of this part of his duty. Hence the posts are filled without compelling the candidates to undergo the trouble of going through any definite or complicated course of instruction or examination. As the nation, however, increases in numbers, as the territory is enlarged and the needs of society become more numerous and more complicated, the number of the posts to be filled becomes greater, and the qualifications

required for the proper performance of the posts grow higher and are of diverse character. The touch of the ruler with each one of the ruled gets less and less, and the ruler cannot possibly keep himself personally abreast of a knowledge of the increase and complicated needs of his people. He becomes, in fact, less qualified to properly fill up all the posts, and he is compelled to delegate this part of his duty to others. In course of time, he discovers that it is not a very satisfactory thing to nominate to posts by means of deputies and that some definite method of selection must be substituted. The considerations which formerly guided him when he alone had personally to nominate, are of such a vague character when placed in the hands of his deputies, that he finds that it is not only not useful but even mischievous to resort to them as, instead of such considerations being in fact given weight to, they simply open a wide door to undue influence and even bribery, and he finds it necessary to discard them and is compelled to limit himself to selection by a public examination of candidates, after they have gone through a course of instruction laid down for the purpose. Thus it happens that all other qualifications such as of family, standing and position and others come to be dispensed with, and the test of public examinations, that is, of personal merit alone, as tested by such examinations, is substituted. It may be conceded at once that it is not a perfect or infallible test. It is a choice of evils. In order however, to guard so far as possible against the evil of dispensing with the other considerations, a certain proportion of the posts is reserved to be filled up by the original method of nomination and the examination test is resorted to for filling up initial posts alone, and promotion is guided by seniority and merit combined. The circumstances above set forth are not peculiar to any particular country or climate, but are equally applicable to all, and it is not correct to say that the above method is a peculiarly Western method and not applicable or adapted to India. In fact, in China which is peculiarly an Eastern country the same method has been of universal application for many centuries past. Moreover, the present rulers of India happen to be foreigners, and in their case, therefore, the considerations, which have led to the method of examination being adopted, apply with even greater force. The above considerations also apply to the method of election and representation, though not with the same force or to the same extent. Hence, election and also nomination in the case of Local Boards, Municipal Corporations, Legislative Councils, and the like. It has been suggested by the Honorable Haji Mohamed Ismail Khan, of the North-West Provinces, that the Congress should pass a resolution "recognizing the absolute necessity of equality of number of Hindu and Mahomedan elected members in Legislative Councils, District Boards and Municipalities . . ." and "wishing all Hindus and Mahomedans to elect" accordingly. It is a good suggestion, but so long as Mussulmans do not join the Congress movement in the same numbers and with the same enthusiasm as the Hindus do, the Congress cannot in fairness be asked to carry out such a suggestion in the manner and to the extent indicated in the suggestion.

11. As to the modes of government prevailing in the West not being adapted to Mussulmans, the observations in answer to objection No. 10 also apply to this objection. The Mussulmans may be reminded that our Holy Prophet did not name a successor. He left it to the believers to elect one for themselves. The Caliph or the successor was originally freely chosen by the free suffrages of the believers and was responsible to them for his acts. In later times this practice was altered, and the Caliphs were made hereditary; but this was done by the confidence and the consent of the believers. But even to this day, the sanction of the believers in the shape of Biat, is deemed necessary. "The Government of Islam," says Mr. Ahmed Risa, "is therefore in the hands of an elective monarch, limited in the exercise of his powers by prescriptive religious traditions. According to Mussulman Law, if the Caliph departs from these traditions, the body of the learned (Ulema) is armed with the right of remonstrating, and is even able to depose him. Amongst these traditions, there is one which makes it obligatory on the Caliph not to do, or even to resolve on, any act without first seeking the advice of the chiefs of the tribes and the doctors of the law—a principle very characteristic of Representative Government. According to Mussulman Law, the Caliph is bound to be just, to respect the liberties of the people, to love his subjects, *to consider their needs*, and *listen to their grievances*." . . . . , "It is clear that Islam knew how to determine and regulate the rights and duties of the sovereign, even before England essayed the task." Islamism has no caste. "Let all your subjects," said Frederick the Great, "have the right to address you directly both in speech and writing." "The Mussulmans," says Mr. Ahmed Riza, "are free from clerical domination, and know nothing of rank or social grade." Said Ali, the fourth Caliph, "Superiority in knowledge is the highest title of honor." "The spirit of self-sacrifice and devotion" of the Mussulmans was remarkable, Mussulman cities were "full of savants and men of letters." "Roman Law and Greek Science continued their evolution among the Arabs." "The best of Holy wars," said our Holy Prophet, "is the righteous word spoken to a monarch who is acting tyrannically." "Islam knows no master: the Commander of the Faithful is only the chosen servant of the people." "Obedience to a Chief is limited; it is founded on the presumption that the Chief commands in the name of the law and in the interests of him who obeys." "'Obey me' said Abu Bekr (the first Caliph,) so long as I go on in good practices. If I deceive myself, warn me. If you do not, you will be responsible'." The Government of Islam is a collective authority in which every free citizen, in possession of his mental faculties, is bound by a common destiny, and shares its responsibilities." "Islamism is not occupied with supra-mundane interests alone. It does not say, 'Leave to Cæsar the things that are Cæsar's." It teaches its adepts that they have a civil duty to fulfil here below, and especially the duty of controlling the conduct of Cæsar." Election and Representation as also Universal Brotherhood are the characteristics of Islam and ought not to be objected to by Mussulmans. All

Mussulmans are equal, and if they want any employment, they must like the rest pass public examinations. If they want any position of rank, they must endeavour to be fit for such position and resort to election, like the rest. Of course, if they can gain such position by nomination, they must thank their good fortune, but if they cannot, they have no right to grumble. They may contend, however, that so far as examinations are concerned, they are at a disadvantage, as compared with the Hindus. If that is so, it is no doubt a misfortune. But surely they must rely on merciful Providence and put their own shoulders to the wheel and by the grace of God they are bound to succeed in their efforts; nay even more, if they have more difficulties to overcome than the Hindus, so much the more creditable will be their success to them, and so much the more will they be qualified, not only for the initial posts, but for higher promotion. In fact, even in India, we find that when Mussulmans do really take to liberal education, they generally equal, if not even surpass the other races, and that Mussulmans are good not only in matters requiring muscle and valour, but also mental powers and intellectual vigor, and the Mussulman community of India can produce distinguished and deeply learned scholars, such as Mr. Justice Budruddin, Mr. Justice Amear Ali and Mr. Justice Mahmood, and here it may be remarked in passing that if Mussulmans in India have a few more leaders of educational advancement, of the calibre and energy, and persistence and devotion, of the type of Syed Sir Ahmed Khan, who has by his life-long services done a great deal for Mussulmans in this matter, and whose name will be remembered with gratitude and admiration for a long time to come, Mussulman education is bound to prosper. The Mussulmans may further contend that in elections they will be swamped. All that may be said here is that they are mistaken in thinking so. They have simply to try, and they will find that they will have no reason to complain. Assuming, however, that they are unsuccessful, notwithstanding their honest endeavours and notwithstanding their fitfulness, why, then Government will, for its own safety, be compelled to come to their help. Objections 12, 13, 14 and 16 have already been answered.

15. It does not follow that, because the Hindus form the majority of the Congress, that the Resolutions of the Congress will be the resolutions of the Hindus. It is a standing rule of the Congress, solemnly passed and recorded that if any proposal is disapproved of by the bulk of either the Hindus or the Mussulmans, the same shall not be carried. Again the Congress is not a meeting of shareholders in a Joint-Stock Company or any other body formed for the gain of profit or for private interests, and a numerical majority does not and cannot influence its decisions—decisions by the bye, which cannot affect anybody as they are simply expressions of opinion, and as such must necessarily depend on their intrinsic sense and reasonableness to carry any weight with Government for whose benefit they are passed. Again, so long as the Congress leaders happen to be men of education and enlightenment, men of approved conduct and wide experience, men, in fact, who have a reputation to lose, the Congress

will never be allowed to run its course for the benefit of sectional, private or party purposes. Again, if the Musssulmans attend Congress meetings, surely the Congress shall be bound to hear and to give careful consideration to Mussulman views, and arguments founded on facts and reason are bound to prevail. Assuming, however, that the Congress is reduced to a rabble meeting, which is not probable, why, then it will lose its position and nobody will pay any attention to its resolutions.

The Mussulmans, however, instead of raising puerile and imaginary objections from a distance, should attend Congress meetings and see for themselves what is going on in such meetings, Indeed, they will find that even when one member puts forward cogent reasons in opposition to the proposal, such proposal is eventually dropped.

17. If the complaint in regard to the conduct referred to in the objection be correct, it may be mentioned that such conduct is not peculiar to any particular race.

It is in the nature of things that persons of low origin, born and brought up in the atmosphere of low morals should on finding themselves suddenly clothed with the authority of the Sircar, get their heads turned and be led into playing the tyrant. The less the education they have received, and the smaller the emoluments their posts carry, the greater their superciliousness, the more marked their contempt for others. Cringing to superior authority and lording it over the people who have anything to do officially with them, are the distinguishing traits of these pests of society. Persons of high birth and culture, who have seen better days and better days and better society, may sometimes be naturally inclined to give to these supercilious tyrants a sound thrashing so as to make them remember it to the end of their days and prevent them from reverting to their evil ways. But persons of high birth and culture naturally recoil from doing anything which may savour of vulgarism, and hence their silent sufferings. Government has been ever ready and willing to check high-handedness and insulting conduct on the part of their native subordinate officials. Europeans, both official and non-official, lovers of manliness and justice as they are, strongly disapprove their hauteur. But no Government, however watchful, and however anxious it may be, can possibly completely eradicate the evil, the true remedies for the removal of which are as follows. The standard of education required of candidates for subordinate official posts should be gradually raised higher and higher so as to compel the candidates to have better education and better culture, in order to make them forget the evil surroundings of their previous life and to take to a better appreciation of the moral law of nature. At the same time education should be disseminated all over the land, and the standard of education of the masses should be gradually and steadily raised, so that the masses, armed with the weapon of Education, may not have meekly to submit to petty tyrannies, but may know how to protect themselves against them and to bring the offenders to a proper sense of their puniness and the impropriety of their conduct by means of union and the

agitation of their grievances, and in legally provocable cases by bringing the culprits to their well-deserved punishment.

All who believe in one God and acknowledge the Holy Prophet are true believers. The fundamental principles of Islam are few and simple. Islam knows no castes and ought not to have divisions and sub-divisions. Yet we find Islam divided into sects, into innumerable divisions. This is certainly against the spirit of Islam, All true believers are equal. By Mussulman Law they can all eat with each other, nay more, they can eat with the followers of the Great Prophets on whom Revelation has descended. All Mussulmans can intermarry, nay more, Mussulman males can marry females from the followers of the Great Prophets. Yet the different sects of Indian Mussulmans will not intermarry, even amongst themselves. It is the duty of all true believers to educate themselves, their wives and their sons and their daughters so as to enable them to know God aright. Yet ignorance is the prevailing rule amongst Indian Mussulmans. Mussulman females are free. Marriage is a contract in which the husband and the wife are parties. Females have independent property. Yet amongst Indian Mussulmans there are frequent cases of maltreatment of wives. The Musjids are places of worship as also places for giving education, and places of meeting for discussion of social and political matters. Yet discussion and consideration and expression of opinions is an exceptional thing amongst Indian Mussulmans. Freedom of speech and liberty of action consistent with a few fundamental and world-recognised principles are the birth-right of Mussulmans. Yet Indian Mussulmans are content to sit idle. To point out to the rulers their own grievances and to ask redress for them is the privilege of Mussulmans. Yet Indian Mussulmans prefer to remain silent. To be active and to be energetic, to be enterprising and to be fearless, has been the characteristic of the faithful. Yet Indian Mussulmans prefer to remain indolent and apathetic. Are not Indian Mussulmans, then, to blame themselves? If the Indian Mussulmans once shake off their lethargy and rid themselves of their apathy, if they unite together and love each other, as members of the same fold, as brothers of a Universal Brotherhood, mix with each other and intermarry, educate themselves, and their wives and children, and meet together and exchange opinion and voice their grievances, and generally endeavour to raise themselves and actively co-operate in the raising of their brethren, they have under merciful Providence as bright a future before them as they had a glorious past. The Indian Mussulmans are a brave and generous race, and it is natural that they should smart under the misfortunes that have overtaken them and resent the treatment that has been and is extended to them. But certainly apathy and lethargy are not the means calculated to reinstate them in anything like their former greatness. Relying, therefore, upon merciful Providence and True Religion, and placing confidence in Almighty God, the Creator of the Universe and the Dispenser of all things, they must rise equal to their present trials, and it is to be fervently hoped that the Benign Ruler may have mercy upon them and raise them again to prosperity and good fortune. One of the obvious means by which Indian Mussulmans can raise themselves is education. It is stated

that there are five crores of Mussulmans in India. It is further stated that the average annual income per head of population in India is rupees twenty-seven. If so, the average annual income of Indian Mussulmans ought to be rupees one hundred and thirty-five crores. The Zakat or tax on this income at the rate of two and a half per cent. comes to nearly rupees three crores. Making all possible allowances for those who may be exempted from payment of Zakat, and for that purpose reducing it to one-tenth, we can have the splendid annual sum of rupees thirty lakhs, that is, at the rate of one anna per annum per head of Mussulmans in India, which is certainly not a very heavy average annual payment. If all the Indian Mussulmans join together and voluntarily contribute as above suggested, they will thereby be fulfilling one of the main commandments of Islam, and thus performing an act of duty. With this magnificent sum, schools for primary, secondary and higher education can be established and maintained, and in such schools education as also food and clothing to students may be given, and there will, thus, every year, be maintained, lodged and edücated thousands and thousands of Indian Mussulman youth. Government will have under the grant-in-aid rules, to contribute to this sum, and thus the total sum will be materially increased. If this system is established and continued, in the course of a few years, education will have permeated all ranks of Indian Mussulmans, and the condition of the whole body will have become so much improved as to be a matter for admiration. What is wanted is voluntary performance on the part of all Indian Mussulmans of a strictly religious duty and on the part of the leaders co-operation and good management, and it is to be devoutly wished that Mussulmans in every part of India, instead of scouting the idea will allow good sense for once to overcome apathy and lethargy and give to this suggestion a sympathetic consideration.

It may be observed here in passing that it is sometimes contended in disparagement of the Indian Mussulmans that "Islam is unfit to be a moral code for a nation to live in": that "the faith of the Islam is incompatible with good Government and with the happiness of a people." Both the above accusations are absolutely false. In fact, the tenets of Islam are inherently capable of good government and good and happy subjects. The very first and most fundamental doctrine of Islam that there is no God but God, that is but one God, is not only the true doctrine, but also binds the true believer to be a respectable man, and, if Mussulmans have become degenerated, it is not on account, but in spite of, Islam. Another fundamental doctrine is that of prayers. Prayers bring the human being in personal contact with his Creator. Another fundamental doctrine is that of observing fast, which teaches men by personal experience to think of the miseries of their fellow human beings. Another fundamental doctrine is that of charity, and which has been admitted all over the earth and in all times to be an excellent virtue. Another fundamental doctrine is that of Haj, which apart from its religious benefit, has all the benefits of travel. There is nothing, therefore, in Islam to cause degeneracy, on the other hand, there is everything in Islam to make Mussulmans loyal subjects and good citizens.

If you will look at the map of India, you will find that India has the appearance of a one-legged horse. India has from time to time been a prey to foreign invasions from without and to internecine wars within. Famine periodically visits the land, and so does plague. English rule has, however, stopped foreign invasion, and the Pax Britannica has put an end to internecine wars. Western arts and Western methods are employed to prevent—at all events to check—famine and plague, to keep them within gradually diminishing limits, and under steadily increasing control it is to be hoped that these monster evils will, in the near future, be completely laid at rest. The resources of the country are being gradually developed and its trade is increasing. Public expenditure, however, under British rule, is increasing by leaps and bounds far beyond the national income that is at present realized, or that can reasonably be expected to be realized in the near future. The average income per year per head of population is, in England, £33 (thirty-three pounds sterling) ; in France, £23 (twenty-three pounds sterling) ; in Russia, over £9 (nine pounds sterling) in Turkey in Europe, (£4 four pounds sterling); whilst in India, it is only Rs 27 (twenty-seven rupees,) or at 1*s*. 4*d* per Rupee £ 1–14–6 (one pound sterling fourteen shillings and 6 pence). Thus the average income per year per head of population of India is about one nineteenth of the average income per year per head of population in England ; or, in other words so far as the annual income is concerned nineteen times better off than India or India is nineteen times worse off than England. Again, the population of India is mostly agricultural. The ratio of town population to country population in India is one to twelve, that is, the agricultural population of India is twelve-thirteenth of the total population of the country. In England the ratio of town population to country population is two to one, that is, the agricultural population in England is only (one-third) of the total population of the country. Thus town population, as compared to country population, is in England. 24 to 12, whilst in India, it is 1–12 ; or, in other words, so far as the ratio of proportion of town population to country population is concerned, England is 24 (twenty-four) times better off than India. Again the population of British India, is, in round numbers, 22 (twenty-two) crores whilst the total Imperial taxation, in round numbers, is Rs. 95 (rupees ninety-five) crores, or, in round numbers, Rs. 4-8 (rupees four and annas eight) per head of population ; and as the average annual income per head is Rs. 27 (rupees twenty-seven), the percentage of taxation to annual income is 4½ to 27, that is, sixteen-and-a-half per cent. The population of the United Kingdom is, in round numbers, about four crores, whilst the total Imperial taxation is a little more than that of India and comes to about Rs. 25 (rupees twenty-five) per head ; and as the average annual income per head is £33, the percentage of taxation to income comes to about six per cent. Thus, so far as the percentage of taxation to income is concerned, India is two-and-a half times worse off than England. Moreover, it is a well-known fact) the same percentage of tax to income, when levied on persons having good incomes, may be easily borne by them and may not be at all felt by them ; when levied on persons having poor or small

incomes—may be heavily felt—may even become wholly unbearable. In fact, this incidence is now well admitted in the case of income-tax, and it is for this reason that on levying that tax, incomes under a certain amount are wholly exempted, and on incomes above that amount and up to a certain amount, there is a sliding scale put into operation. Thus the ratio of 16½ per cent. of taxation to income, in the case of India, though nominally only two-and-a-half times higher than the ratio in the case of England, is in incidence, considerably more heavy, and India is therefore, in reality, considerably worse off than that ratio indicates. Again, in the year 1849–50, the population of British India was about fifteen crores, whilst the expenditure was about twenty-seven crores. In the year 1894–95 the population was about twenty-two crores, whilst the expenditure was about ninety-five crores. The increase, in population, therefore, was about fifty per cent., whilst the increase, in taxation was about three hundred and fifty per cent., that is, the growth of expenditure was about seven times the growth of population. During the same period, the charges of collection rose from 6·06 to 9·75 that is, more than fifty per cent.; the expenditure on civil administration rose from 6 to 14·83, that is, more than 240 per cent. and the expenditure on Army rose from 11·39, to 24·31, that is, more than 213 per cent. Again, the estimated debt of British India for the year 1895 is £ 127 (one hundred and twenty-seven million pounds, whilst that of Great Britain is £660 (six hundred and sixty million pounds). Thus the Indian debt is about one-fifth of the British debt, whilst the capacity of India for repayment of debt, as judged by the average annual income per head of population, is only one-nineteenth! Again, the debt of Great Britain in the year 1875 was £ 780 (seven hundred and eighty million pounds); of India £ 130 (one hundred and thirty million pounds). Thus, from the year 1875 to the year 1895, the British debt is reduced by £ 120 (one hundred and twenty million pounds); whilst that of India, only by £ 3 (three million pounds). Again the rate of interest on public loan in England, in the year 1875, was 3¼ (three and one-fourth) per cent.; in India, 4 (four per cent.) and there is still a corresponding difference in favour of England and against India. Again, Great Britain annually pays, by way of interest, 12s. 9d. (twelve shillings and nine pence) per head; and, as the average annual income per head is £ 33 in England, the proportion of interest to income is nearly two per cent. India annually pays, by way of interest, annas three and pies nine per head; and, as the average annual income per head is Rs. 27 in India, the population of interest to income is nearly one per cent. Thus a British subject, who, so far as his average income is concerned, is nineteen times better off than a British Indian subject, has to pay, by way of interest on national debt, only two per cent, out of his average income, wihlst an Indian subject, who, so far as his average income is concerned, is nineteen times worse off than a British subject, has to pay one per cent, that is, in this respect also, is nine times worse off than British subject. Again, the Imperial expenditure of the United Kingdom has risen from 81 (eighty-one million pounds) in the year 1881 to 94 (ninety-four millions) in the year 1895. This addition is caused, for the most part, by an increase

of the naval and military from 25 (twenty-five) to 38 (thirty-eight millions), an exceptional and temporary measure. The charges of the national debt have decreased from 28 (twenty-eight) to 25 (twenty-five millions), and the debt itself from 770 (seven hundred and seventy) to 660 (six-hundred and sixty millions). The Imperial expenditure of India has risen from 71 (seventy-one) crores in the year 1881 to 94½ (ninety-four-and a-half crores) in the year 1894. The charges on the national debt have, contrary to what has happened in England, instead of decreasing, risen from 485 (four crores and eighty five lacs of rupees) in the year 1881, to 512 (five crores and twelve lacs) in the year 1894, and the debt itself has increased from the year 1884 to the year 1894 as follows, that is, permanent debt in India from 93 (ninety-three crores) and odd to Rs. 104 (one hundred and four crores and odd,) and permanent debt in England from 69,271,088 (sixty-nine millions and odd) to Rs. 114,005,826 (one hundred fourteen millions and odd). Again the total land, according to the survey of India is 539,848,840 (five hundred and thirty-nine and odd). Of this land actually cropped is 196,600688, current follows, thirty millions and odd ; available for cultivation, 99 (ninety-nine millions and odd) ; not available for cultivation, 113 (one hundred and thirteen millions and odd). Forests, 62 sixty-two millions). The average incident of Government Revenue per cultivated acre is one rupee three annas and two and two-fifths pies. The population of British India is 22 [twenty-two crores]. The average acreage under food-crops is 18·60 [eighteen crores and odd]. The average of food-crops per acre [both irrigated and unirrigated is 0·31 ton or 694 [six hundred and ninety-four pounds]. The total of food-crops is 576 [five crores seventy-six lacs tons]. The average consumption of food-grains per head of the population per annum is 585 lbs. [five hundred and eighty-five pounds] or per day 1·60 lbs. [one pound and six-tenths pounds]. The total consumption is 5·77 five crores and seventy- seven lacs tons). It is clear, from the above facts and figures, that India is a very poor country ; that it is an agricultural country with but few manufactures, that Indians are a poor nation, living from hand to mouth—indeed, some of them actuallystarving and many of them having barely one meal a day ; that taxation is very heavy ; that charges for collection and the cost of administration, both civil and military, have increased far beyond the capacity of meeting them ; that, notwithstanding the heavy taxation, the national debt—specially the gold debt and the charges to meet such debt —are steadily increasing.

That the Indians are a poor people, that they are overtaxed, that the Civil and Military expenditure of India is excessive, that the drain from India is of a ruinous character, that both justice and self-interest demand of our rulers that native labour should be more and more substituted for foreign labour and that all unproductive expenditure should be stopped, the following extracts from the speeches and writings of English statesmen themselves, make abundantly clear.

Mr. Bright, in the House of Commons, 14th June, 1858 :—

"The cultivators of the soil, the great body of the population of India, are in a condition of great impoverishment, of great dejection, and of great suffering."

Lord Lawrence in 1864:—

"The mass of the people enjoy only a scanty subsistence."

Lord Lawrence, before the Select Committee of the House of Commons, in 1873:—

"The mass of the people of India are so miserably poor that they have barely the means of subsistence."

Major Baring, Finance Minister of India, in his Budget speech, 1882, after stating that the average income per annum per head of population in India is Rs. 27, says:— "It is sufficiently accurate to justify the conclusion that the tax-paying community is exceedingly poor."

Mr. Gladstone, in the House of Commons, 10th May 1870, said that India was "too much burdened."

Mr. Bright, in his speech at the Manchester Town hall, 11th December, 1877:—

"I say that a Government......which has levied taxes till it can levy no more......and which has borrowed......more than all that it can levy......"

Mr. Gladstone, in the House of Commons, 30th June 1893,:—"The expenditure of India and especially the Military *Expenditure* is alarming."

Lord Salisbury:—"India must be bled."

Lord Salisbury, Secretary of State for India, Minute, 29th April 1875:— "......where (in India) so much of the revenue is exported without a direct equivalent."

Mr. Bright, in the House of Commons, 24th June, 1858:—"We must in future have India governed, not for a handful of Englishmen,......"

Sir George Wingate in "A Few Words on our Financial Relations with India" 1859:—

"They [taxes not spent in India] constitute....an absolute loss and extinction of the whole amount withdrawn from the taxed country."

Mr. Fawcett, in the House of Commons, 5th May 1868:—

"Lord Metcalfe had well said that the bane of our system was that the advantages were reaped by one class and the work was done by another."

The Duke of Argyll, in the House of Lords, 11th March 1869:—

"I must say that we have not fulfilled *our duty* or the promises and engagements which we have made."

Sir George Wingate in "A Few Words on our Financial Relations with India." 1859:—

"Such is the nature of the tribute we have so long exacted from India...... From this explanation some faint conception may be formed of the cruel, crushing effect of the tribute upon India." "The Indian tribute, whether weighed in the scales of justice, or viewed in the light of our own interest, will be found to be at variance with humanity, with common sense...."

Lord Hartington, Secretary of State for India, in the House of Commons, 23rd August 1883:—

"The Government of India cannot afford to spend more than they do on the administration of the country and if the country is to be better governed, that can only be done by the employment of the best and most intelligent of the natives in the service."

Lord Randolph Churchill, Secretary of State for India, in a letter to the Treasury, 1886:—

"The position of India in relation to taxation and the sources of public revenue is very peculiar......from the character of the Government which is in the hands of foreigners who hold all the principal administrative offices and form so large a part of the Army. The impatience of the new taxation which will have to be borne wholly as a consequence of the foreign rule imposed on the country, and virtually to meet additions to charges arising outside of the country, would constitute a political danger the real magnitude of which it is to be feared is not at all appreciated by persons who have no knowledge of or concern in the Government of India, but which those responsible for that Government have long regarded as of the most serious order."

The table, recently prepared by Mr. W. Martin Wood, formerly Editor of the *Times of India*, whose knowledge of Indian finance and economics is surpassed by few, and who in his retirement still takes a deep and abiding interest in Indian affairs, gives the financial condition of the country at a glance so well that I will reproduce it here for your information. *(For the table, see page 129 Part I).*

Again, in the words of another Englishman, money is leaving the country without commercial "equivalent" to the tune of £ 25,000,000 [twenty-five millions pounds] yearly, or if you take the present fall of the rupee into consideration, then to the tune of forty millions pounds yearly. In short, it is as clear as possible that the ability of the country to bear any fresh taxation is exhausted, and any further burden on the taxpayers would simply break their back—a dangerous consequence to be avoided at all hazard. Yet it is stated that Indians should remain silent, forsooth because it will be an act of disloyalty to discuss, aye even to discuss in a loyal and constitutional manner with the best of motives, honourable in themselves and calculated to ensure the safety of the country and the maintenance of the British rule in India, moderate measures of reform. It is true that English rule in India has done much for India, but much more yet remains to be done,and it is a matter of extreme surprise as well as of deep regret that the sort of supercilious objection above referred to comes from people who, to say the least of it, ought to know better. With the above facts and figures, and it is certainly not an overdrawn picture glaring in their faces, all true lovers of their country, and all its inhabitants, and all its rulers, possessing the most ordinary common sense, if they have even a spark of humanity left in them, ought to bestir themselves, and leaving aside all differences arising from difference of race or creed and forgetting even just resentment, if there is any, join with their fellow countrymen in the movement—sober and temperate as it is—expressly organised for the amelioration of the country, of their countrymen, themselves included. The objectionists should remember that even the most honest

and the best regulated administration has constant need of proper criticism even at the best of times. For all Governments are, in their nature, monopolists, and as such have constantly to be watched and warned. In India, moreover, on account of its foreign character,it is excessively bureaucratic, more than other Governments in the world are, and, hence the greater necessity for constant watchful criticism on the part of the people. The Government of India, moreover, consisting as it does of capable and well-meaning gentlemen, is from the nature of its position and constitution, between two conflicting interests, the interests of England and the interests of India, and it is the sacred duty of all loyal Indian subjects to strengthen the hands of the Government of India in its laudable efforts to obtain financial justice for India by moral support of the united Indian nation; and judged from this point of view, keeping aloof from the Congress movement is not only undesirable but may even merit censure.

If the short sketch above given of the Financial result of the British administration in India for one century only be correct, we are necessarily forced to ask "if these be the results in the green leaf, what will they be in the dry wood?" And yet Indian Mussulmans still hold aloof, alike from western education and from those political movements among our countrymen to which western education has given rise and when appealed to, they talk of difficulties in their way and ask for special encouragement and special facilities and special privileges. "Special encouragement to any class," said the Education Commission, "is in itself an evil, and it will be a sore reproach to the Mussulmans if the pride they have shown in other matters does not stir them up to a course of honourable activity; to a determination that whatever their backwardness in the past they will not suffer themselves to be outstripped in the future; to a conviction that self-help and self-sacrifice are at once nobler principles of conduct and surer paths to worldly success than sectarian reserve or the hope of exceptional indulgence."

Indeed it will be a happy day for India when the disproportion between the Mahomedans who ought to be at school, and those who are actually at school, is reduced to the lowest possible minimum, and the Indian Mussulmans, as a body, make it a point to educate their children and actively co-operate in all the public movements in the country generally and especially, "our good Congress, the germ of future federated parliament.......with hearts honest, true and unselfish".........and participate in our great bloodless battle for justice and freedom and specially make a beginning now when "all minor sources of anxiety are overshadowed by the cloud now impending over our beloved land in which we too plainly discern the gloomy spectre of famine frowning down upon....a teeming, frugal and ceaselessly industrious population" and join in asking a redress at the hands of Government and in expressing disapproval of the mistaken system, whereby the entire resources of 220 millions of people are placed at the disposal of able and well-meaning men who are nevertheless foreigners, who cannot in the nature of things sufficiently and adequately appreciate the wants, the necessities, the real condition of the people over whom they rule, and are naturally though

unconsciously drifting to the conclusion that India is to be ruled for the glory of Great Britain and not for the good of her own people. That this system is a mistaken one and that a strong financial check is necessary is now admitted by eminent Englishmen themselves. Lord Welby, President of the Royal Commission now sitting, says "Sir David Barbour made a criticism, which I think all officers connected with Financial departments must allow as a criticism, of general application, namely, that sufficient attention is not given by the departments in India to the financial question. They hardly appreciate the gravity of it, and do not forecast what the financial effect of the measures on which they are bent may be. That, of course, is a defect common to all Governments. The heads of different departments very seldom take a general view of the effect of their administration. They are anxious to carry out measures which they think are important." Sir David Barbour says, "I certainly think something is very desirable, that which would ensure greater attention being paid to financial consideration in connextion with the Government of India......I think it would be better for India, better all round, if more attention were given to the financial question, and if we went more slowly in periods of great apparent financial prosperity."......Sir Auckland Colvin agrees with Sir David Barbour in the opinion......Lord Welby further says "the point of Sir David Barbour's criticism, I think, might be put thus: that in a country like India where deficits are more dangerous than they would be here, where new taxation is more difficult than it would be here, the Government as a whole does not give sufficient attention to what may be the financial results of measures which it adopts."......Whereupon Sir Auckland Colvin remarks, "I agree entirely to that, that in a country where the taxpayer is an alien, and is not able to make his voice directly hard, the need of giving close attention to economy in administration is greater than it would otherwise be." From these remarks coming as they do from such high authorities this Congress will be perfectly justified in coming to the conclusion that "the discussion upon the Budget, both in India and in Parliament, needs to be converted from a farce into a reality," and that all thinking and reasonable men will be justified in expecting all the races inhabiting British Indla to join the Congress and co-operate with it in the cause of their country and of themselves. Indeed, I have a presentiment, that in the very near future my co-religionists will not only join the Congress movement, but take active part in moulding it and will deem it the highest price of their Civic life to be permitted to preside at its sittings.

I now come to the most absorbing topic of the hour. After a lapse of twenty years, famine has again overtaken a greater part of the country. The insufficiency of rain-fall in Behar, in the North-West provinces, in the Punjab, in parts of Central India, in many districts of Bombay and Madras and in Mysore, has already led to distress among those classes who habitually live from hand to mouth. The cultivators, whose impoverished condition is well-known, are the greatest sufferers. Next come the class of small artisans and weavers, and then the day-labourers who barely eke out an anna per day as wages. The prices of food grains in every one

of the afflicted tracts went up high, in some cases 50 and 100 per cent. This occurrence was most unusual. It has seldom happened that at the very beginning of the season of scarcity prices of wheat, rice, bajri, and jowari have gone up so high as has been the case at present. That such a condition of affairs should have created panic and led even to looting and rioting as in Sholapur, in Nagpur, and elsewhere is not unintelligible. The people seem to have been frightened at the insufficiency of food-grain. They naturally thought that if a limited stock of grain, at the very commencement of the scarcity, should raise prices so high, what might happen when the season advances and the stocks are exhaused? No doubt, the first impulse was to curse the Bania grain-dealer and lay on his head all their woes. But as the panic subsided, and as it became known that Government would spare no efforts to relieve the distressed, while the long arm of charity may be expected to loyally assist the efforts of the State, prices went down a little. This may be taken as the situation at present. The weekly official reports show that upwards of two lakhs of the persons in various parts of the country are already employed on relief work, and that as week after week advances the number will swell till at last it may reach a maximum in April and May, the number of which it is impossible to forecast at present. Every presidential and provincial Government has been straining its nerve to do its level best to cope with the distress which really bespeaks well of the humanity of our Government. British civilisation could not tolerate famine. And the head of the State has already declared from his place in the Council Chamber that his Government will endeavour to save life at all cost and all hazard. Let us all devoutly hope that it may be so able to achieve its noble intention without indulging in hope or prospect not founded on the realities or circumstances prevailing in the country. To entertain sanguine prospects which may not only be not realised but which may end in heavy mortality, otherwise preventible, would be grievous. For when we recall to mind the disastrous mortality which took place in 1877-78, when, according to official accounts, over 50 lakhs of human beings perished, we cannot but contemplate with the gravest apprehension what may befall unhappy India at this dismal juncture, should the efforts and energy of the State, with all the ample resources and most perfect organisation at its command, be found to be not so satisfactory as the people have been led to expect. I do not mean to say that these efforts and energies will be wanting. But it is not unlikely that, here and there, owing to more sanguine estimates of food and fodder and other optimistic views, the same care and attention may not be paid. You may have on paper the most perfect Famine Code; but, unless those entrusted with its work, from the highest to the lowest, do not fall short in carrying out its provisions by a variety of causes, it is not unlikely that mortality, otherwise preventible, may ensue. It is, therefore, the duty of every citizen and public body to heartily second the efforts of our benign rulers in saving life. The Press, too, is doing an invaluable service in placing before the public from day to day all intelligence regarding the famished in various parts of the country. It is discharg-

ing a noble duty worthy of its sacred functions, and we cannot but express our gratitude to it for its enterprise, which enables it to give such wide publicity to all intelligence in connexion with the famine. Its argus eyes can detect neglect, indifference or mismanagement anywhere, and enable the authorities concerned to set matters right at once. The primary and essential function is to see that relief is given in time, that it is not allowed to be too late when it may become impossible to save lives.

That the Government, as the Hon'ble Mr. Woodburn observed the other day, is in a better position to-day to cope, and cope effectively, with famine, than it was 20 years ago, is no doubt perfectly true. We have had two crores of irrigation works and seven crores of protective railways constructed since 1880 out of the Famine Fund. Facilities of communication have been vastly increased; many a tract of the country has been brought within the radius of our railways both trunk and branch. All these are assuring elements in connection with the present famine which were wanting in 1877-78. But, while admitting these facts, we should not forget that despite branch or feeder railways, despite increased communications, despite other facilities of transit, if there be no sufficient food-stock in the country to move from the locality where it may be a surplusage to one where it may be most wanted, then these appliances and resources are unhappily of no avail.

Thus the most pressing question of the hour is not irrigation or railways, but the stock of food in the country. For your own province, I was rejoiced to see the other day from the note issued by your public-spirited and energetic Lieutenant-Governor that though there was an insufficiency of rice, the surplus of the Burma crops, plus importations from Singapur and Saigon, might be able to supply it. The Upper Provinces, under able administratorship of the equally energetic Sir Antony Macdonnell, are a wheat consuming country. Though wheat has been less exported from those provinces last year for purposes of exports, it is not impossible that there may yet be a deficiency and if that is so, wheat may be imported from Persia, and Russia and even America though at a dear rate. Thus the wants of that populous, but very poor, province might be fairly supplied. It is needless for me to inform you that the N. W. Provinces and Oudh have a population numbering $4\frac{3}{4}$ crores. But it is so poor on the whole that according to the weekly reports the largest number of persons *gratuitously* relieved are to be found in that province, and it also has the largest number of persons employed on relief works. But as regards the food-supply of the Central Provinces, Bombay, and Madras, I have not yet noticed full and detailed official estimates being placed before the public and if that is so, I hope it will soon be done, for you will agree that an approximate knowledge of the stock vastly helps private enterprise and private charity between them to import grain and pour it into those localities where it is most needed.

But, this question of the stock of grain shows clearly that India lives from hand to mouth. A leading weekly journal in Bombay, the *Champion*, gave

statistics a few weeks ago, based on the figures of the outturn of food per acre as given by the Famine Commissioners, shewing that with a population of 22 crores in British India, the total quantity of food required, at the rate of 1½ lbs. per day per head, was 5·80 crores of tons, while the actual outturn of food-crops could not be estimated at more than 5·76 crore tons, taking 18·60 crore acres as the whole area cultivated for these, and computing the outturn at 3·1 ton or 694 lbs. per acre. These statistics would lead us to infer that the outturn of food just sufficed for the population. But there is an average export of 25 lakhs of tons beyond the sea. If then exports were taken into account, the quantity actually retained for home consumption would be *protanto* diminished, that is to say, while the food required was 5·80 crore tons, the quantity available was only 5·51. This would signify a deficiency of 29 lakhs of tons which would mean insufficiency of grain for a crore of the population. If these statistics are wholly or even approximately correct and we have no reason for thinking they are not as they are founded on official figures, you may imagine, how perilous is the situation. The late Sir James Caird observed that India had no food-stock surplus to last even for ten days. Since he made that statement, which has never been contradicted, population has vastly increased, while the area annually cultivated for food-crops is barely enough. A further comparison shows that the area sown for non-food crops is relatively larger, as may be seen from the following table :—

	In crores of acres. 1880-81.	1894-95.	Percentage of increase.
Total food-crops	16·62	18·62	12
Total non-food crops ..	2·15	3·90	81

Thus, while the acreage of food-crops has only increased 12 per cent. in fifteen years, the acreage of non-food crops has increased 81 per cent., or almost doubled. Though it is a matter of satisfaction to know that the area for merchantable crops has increased almost double, that the area for food crops should not show the same growth is a matter not only for regret but for deep reflection by every one interested in the better welfare of the country, so far as the annual food-supplies are concerned.

To us, again, it is a further matter of regret that the substitution of the system of paying the land revenue in cash for that in kind, is having its pernicious effect on our ryot. Whatever may be the merits of the cash system, it is to be feared it is not exactly suited to the cultivators of the country. The *kind* system previously in vogue was automatic in its incidence, and so far was most conducive to the happiness of the ryot. Whatever the condition of the crops, he had enough food-grain to last him for domestic consumption. If the crop was 16 annas, he paid in proportion to the State in kind. If it was 8 annas the proportion to be paid to the State would diminish. Thus, the State dues fluctuated according to the condition of the crops, while the factor of food for annual domestic consumption remained constant. This system, in a great measure, tended to alleviate distress at

the very outset of the scarcity. The cash system is wanting in this element and so far is defective.

This leads me, to rivet your attention on the great danger looming in the near future in connection with our agrarian problem. It is, I admit, a gigantic problem and has been staring our rulers in the face for many a year past. Now and again palliatives have been applied by means of legislation. But palliative measures, you will admit, are, after all, no permanent solution of the problem. A broad, comprehensive, and practical solution is imperative, and it will require the highest experience and statesmanship to devise a remedy which may cure the disease, which is growing year by year and deepening in its intensity. I entreat you all to reflect on this grave situation, for, to my mind, the greatest danger to our country, in the near future, is what may arise from agrarian agitation. There is nothing like the rebellion of the belly. Government has been for years most unwisely spending millions against the so-called external danger. The expenditure is said to be an insurance against invasions, and yet we have a terrible invasion arising from hunger within the country itself, while there is no serious effort yet made to build an insurance against such internal danger. This must be, to all of us, a matter of the deepest regret. Let it be our endeavour, to the best of our power and ability, to assist the Government in its arduous task by suggesting suitable remedies. Two years ago, Sir Antony Macdonnell, as the Home Secretary of the Government of India, informed the public, from his place in the Supreme Legislative Council, that Government had on the anvil such a broad and comprehensive solution of the agrarian difficulty. Let us hope that, as soon as the hands of the Government are free from famine, it may devote all its ability and energy on this important topic. Let it be the good fortune of our present Viceroy, the liberal and sympathetic Earl of Elgin to inaugurate such a practical agricultural reform as may restore agricultural prosperity to India and extricate her ryots from their present impoverished and distressed situation and earn for his lordship a deep and lasting gratitude.

The next subject of importance is that of the growing expenditure of the Administration, both in its Civil and Military branch.

The famine has conclusively demonstrated, beyond all other facts and all other statistics, the existence of the poverty of India to which our patriotic Grand Old Man, Mr. Dadabhai Naoroji, has been persistently drawing the serious attention of our rulers. That one main source of that poverty is the annual drain of millions of the national wealth, is now admitted everywhere. None can deny the fact, however plausibly it may be explained away. When we come to analyse the cause of that drain, we are confronted with the enormous expenditure incurred in England on civil and military pensions, India office establishments, and what are generally called, Home charges. More or less, they are undoubtedly the outcome of the costly foreign agency in the administration—a subject on which the Congress has continued to express its emphatic opinion from time to time during the twelve years of its existence. I do not propose to enter here into the details of this grave economic phenomenon. But to us it is a matter of some satisfaction

to know that, in respect to the costliness of the administration, there is now sitting a Royal Commission to investigate the whole subject, a Commission which is the direct fruit of the agitation by this Congress, and by none more than Mr. Dadabhai Naoroji and Sir William Wedderburn. None can deny that, but for their strenuous exertions in Parliament to have this Commission appointed, India to-day would have been still without any inquiry. The last one was in 1874. But the Fawcett Committee, as it was called, concluded its sittings without a report. This Commission, however, has had now thirty sittings and has already recorded the evidence of expert officials, both in active employ and in retirement. Among the latter are two distinguished *ex*-Finance Ministers, Sir David Barbour and Sir Auckland Colvin, and Captain Hext. It is a gratification to see from their evidence that they have made out a strong case for greater control over the expenditure of the Government of India, specially military and naval; the two *ex*-Finance Ministers, are of opinion that, with a *pro*-military Viceroy, the chances of his dominating his whole Council and incurring any amount of military expenditure of an irresponsible character, in league with the military element in the Executive Council, are many, which can be hardly said to be conducive to the interests of the already overburdened taxpayers. These retired officials have also given their opinion that the limits of taxation have been already strained, and pointed out the danger of further taxation. Sir David Barbour again, has admitted that Parliamentary control over all expenditure, as wisely suggested by Sir William Wedderburn, is expedient. He will not, however, give his unqualified concurrence to the scheme which requires modification. So far, it may be observed that the evidence is satisfactory and in the very direction the Congress has for years been pointing out. Again, it must be said that the evidence of Sir Edwin Collen has completely established the contention of the Congress regarding the appalling growth of military expenditure, even after making all allowances for necessary and unavoidable increases. Mr. Stephen Jacob, too, whose evidence was exhaustive, has made out a case as to the unfair character of expenditure which the Home Office foists on India. You are aware that the Congress, as well as the Government of India, are at one on the question of the apportionment of Home Charges. And Mr. Jacob's evidence is therefore eminently satisfactory in this respect. Let us, Gentlemen, do all in our power to further strengthen the hands of our Indian Government by once more placing on record our opinion regarding the financial injustice from which India has been suffering for many years past. If the Royal Commission does nothing else but recommends a fair apportionment of the charges to be borne by India and England respectively, it will have rendered the greatest service to this country and justified its appointment. Lastly, it is a pleasure to notice that thanks to the persistent efforts of the representatives on behalf of India—Sir W. Wedderburn and Messrs. Dadabhai Naoroji and Caine—the Commission has at last allowed reporters to attend its sittings. Publicity adds to the value of public enquiry. The Congress owes a deep debt of gratitude to these gentlemen for their disinterested exertions

throughout in this matter. Let me add here that my indefatigable friend Mr. D. E. Wacha has been elected by the Bombay Presidency Association to proceed to England and to give his evidence before the Royal Commission, and I have no doubt whatever that zealous and hard-working as he has been throughout his life in the cause of our country and a master as he is of the facts and figures regarding Indian finance, his evidence will be of very great use to us and assist the Commission in coming to the right conclusion.

I will now proceed to another important topic on which not only the Congress has expressed its own views but every Provincial Conference in the country has done the same. I mean the reform, which is absolutely necessary and expedient, in connection with the discussion of Imperial and Provincial Budgets. Though we all appreciate the privilege conferred on the expanded Legislative Councils to discuss the budget, there is no power to move amendments and vote on it. So far all life is taken out of these budget debates. And for all practical purposes, the discussion is purely academic. Though this is the fourth year of the expanded Councils, the most pungent criticism on the budget in the Imperial Council makes no difference whatever and has no practical effect. Though the representatives of the public give voice to public opinion in the Council Chamber, their utterances go unheeded. This is not a satisfactory state of matters. If budgets are to be popular and if the people and the press are to influence these for good, it is essential that the budgets should be voted upon. Otherwise, budget discussions will remain the farces that they are, and it is to be earnestly hoped that our rulers will see their way to instituting an early reform in this matter. The fear that the Government may be over-ridden is groundless. There is not a Council in the empire in which the official element does not preponderate, and it is absurd to expect that Government could at all be swamped. It is a curious anomaly that, though in Local Self-Government the representatives of the people can discuss their civil finances, and divide on them they cannot do so on the larger subject of the finances of the province and the whole empire. I repeat, therefore, the hope I have already expressed that the Government, will at an early day, see the reasonableness, aye, the justice of our demand and grant us the same as conducive to the greater welfare and contentment of the people.

Since our last sitting (at Poona) the cruel hand of death has deprived us of several of our most energetic workers, friends and sympathisers. Foremost among them stands the name of the late Mr. Mano Mohun Ghose, an enthusiastic and steady worker from the early years of this movement. His great abilities and rare legal acumen, his special study of Indian questions, especially the urgent need of the separation of judicial from executive functions, his untiring zeal and moderation, his great powers and readiness in debate and wide-spread influence combined to make him best fitted to espouse his country's cause. His sudden and untimely removal from our midst leaves a blank which it will be hard to fill, but his services to the Congress will keep his memory always green in the annals of this movement. In the death of Rao Bahadur H. H. Dhruva of Gujarat, a scholar of Euro-

pean reputation, who represented H. H. the Gaekwar at the Norway and Sweden Oriental Congress, our movement loses another worker, whose zeal and enthusiasm for the Congress knew no bounds ; he went from village to village pleading the Congress-cause, and spared neither time nor money in its advocacy. He was a District Judge on our side of the country, but as soon as he was freed from the trammels of office, the first thing he did was to attend the Karachi Provincial Conference in the scorching heat of May last, and died within a fortnight of his return from that place. Western India, especially Gujarat, will long mourn his loss. By the death of Mr. C. Narayana Swami Naidu of Nagpore, the Congress has lost another staunch supporter to whose enthusiasm the entire success which attended the Nagpore Congress was due.

You are all aware that the reign of Her Most Gracious Majesty the Queen Empress of India has recently exceeded in duration that of any of Her Most Excellent Majesty's predecessors, (Cheers) and that this auspicious event is to be celebrated in or about June next. Whatever may be the differences between the different races inhabiting this vast country on political or other grounds, the whole of India is unanimous in the opinion that Her Majesty has throughout her reign been ever anxious for the welfare of all her Indian subjects and has ever treated them with the same kindness and with the solicitude with which she has treated all her other subjects. To Her Majesty all her subjects are equal without any distinction of caste, creed, race or color. She is the ever-affectionate mother of all her subjects, and all her subjects, whether near her or far away from her, are to her, her children. (Cheers) Whatever might be the political views of Her Majesty's ministers for the time being, whoever might be in authority under Her Majesty in India, Her Majesty has throughout thrown the great weight of her high authority in favour of equal treatment of all her subjects alike. You are all aware of the great Proclamation from Her Majesty to the people of the country, and which Proclamation is rightly regarded by the people of this country, as their great Charter and cherished accordingly. You are all aware that Her Majesty issued the said Proclamation unasked, and thus did an act of a signal, illustrious, very rare and unrivalled magnanimity, an act fraught with seeds of deep and abiding value. That she, the august sovereign of an Empire, over which the sun never sets ; that she, the constitutional ruler of a country that leads the advanced guard in the march of liberty and of civilization, should deign to look over and care for us, who have fallen back amongst stragglers in the rear, is in itself a proof of her high generosity. It is not for us and in this place to pass in review the imporant incidents of her long, glorious and illustrious reign. Suffice it to say that the Victorian era will be ever remembered throughout the British Empire with deep feelings of pride and pleasure, and in the rest of the world with those of wonder and admiration. Let, therefore, this Congress, of delegates from all parts of India humbly offer its dutiful and loyal congratulations to Her Most Gracious Majesty the Queen Empress on her memorable, beneficent and glorious reign, exceeding in length of time the reign of any of her predecessors, and heartily wish her many more and happy yearsof rule

over the great British Empire. Let us all fervently pray that benign and merciful Providence may shower over her its choicest blessings, and guide her in futures as it has guided her in the past, in the path of duty and of righteousness, and that she may be enabled to complete her glorious work in India by bestowing on her grateful Indian subjects the same rights and privileges as are enjoyed by her British subjects, by removing all disabilities which still cling to us, notwithstanding Her Royal Mandate to the contrary. By conferring on us the boon we ask for, in fulfilment of her own gracious proclamation, Her Majesty will not only command the prayers of her Indian subjects, but also secure the sympathies of the whole civilized world. Her sagacious clemency will ever live in the hearts of her Indian subjects, and will indeed assure the prosperity, as well as the continued and devoted loyalty, of India. The English nation is well known for its manliness, and manliness is associated with love of justice, generosity and intellect. It is the force of character, as also the force of circumstances, that have given Englishmen their present power. In fact, they are masterful men, and we trust they will therefore join with us in our prayers to our and their Sovereign on this auspicious occasion, and thus assist in inaugurating a truly liberal measure of reform, and thereby earn credit and achieve a reputation of which all manly hearts ought to be proud.

It now remains for me to say that in the discussion of the several important matters that will be placed before you for your consideration, you will show the same moderation, both of language and thought, as you have hitherto displayed. May mercifiul Providence guide us all, both you and myself, in the discharge of our duties on this important occasion, and may our deliberations contribute to the benefit of all concerned.—(*Loud and prolonged cheering.*)

Thirteenth Congress—Amraoti—1897.

—***—

Hon. Mr. C. Sankaran Nair.

GENTLEMAN,

I thank you heartily for electing me to preside over this great national assembly. We meet at the close of a year that will be memorable in the history of the British Empire. We have witnessed and we have taken part in the celebration of the Diamond Jubilee of the reign of our Empress. We rejoice with our fellow-subjects of this vast Empire in the prosperity of that reign. We exult in our acquisition of political rights during this period. We bless Her Majesty for her message in 1858 of peace and freedom when the occasion invested it with a peculiar significance. While Englishmen in India inflamed by race animosity and the recollection of the Sepoy Mutiny, which ignorance still calls the Indian Mutiny, were calling for terrible reprisals, she unasked, forgetting and forgiving, issued her gracious proclamation. It was a stern reproof to those who then clamoured for indiscriminate vengeance; it continues today a standing rebuke to those of her European subjects who would deny us the rights of equal citizenship. She is to us the living embodiment of what is good in British supremacy, and we may feel assured that her anxiety in our behalf which she manifested in 1858, her kindly regard shown on every subsequent occasion, both in times of joy and of affliction, will continue unabated for the rest of her life. Throughout our land her name is venerated; in almost every language the story of her life has been written and sung, and in years to come her name will rightly find a place in the memory of our descendants along with those great persons whose virtues have placed them in the ranks of Avatars born into this world for the benefit of this, our holy land.

Forty years of peace and progress seemed to have amply justified the wise and generous statesmanship of the great Empress, when suddenly this year, we have been startled with the cry of sedition directed not against any specific individual nor even against a number of persons but against a whole class, the product of the liberal policy inaugurated nearly half a century ago. The charge of sedition, faintly heard years ago, against the Congress, a charge the absurdity of which has been often exposed, has now been revived against the educated Indians by a section of the Anglo-Indian Press. We are tauntingly asked to study our past history for proof of our

degraded condition from which the English Government has raised us, and to contrast it with the blessings we now enjoy. We do not need the invitation. We are acquainted with our immediate past; we feel grateful for the present. But, our opponents forget we are more concerned with the progress of our country in the future than with the benefits we have already derived under British rule.

We are well aware of the disordered state of this country when it passed, with its insecurity of person and property, under British rule, of the enormous difficulties our rulers had to overcome in introducing orderly administration without any help from the then existing agencies. We recognize that the association of the people in the Government of the country except to a very limited extent was then impossible. We also know that British rule cleared the way to progress and furnished us with the one element, English education, which was necessary to rouse us from the torpor of ages and bring about the religious, social and political regeneration which the country stands so much in need of. We are also aware that with the decline of British supremacy we shall have anarchy, war and rapine. The Mahomedans will try to recover their lost supremacy. The Hindu races and chiefs will fight amongst themselves. The lower castes who have come under the vivifying influence of Western civilization are scarcely likely to yield without a struggle to the dominion of the higher castes. And we have Russia and France waiting for their opportunities. The ignorant masses may possibly not recognize the gravity of the danger attendant on any decline of England's power in the East. But it is ridiculous to suggest that those who have received the benefit of English education are so shortsighted enough not to see and weigh that danger. While, however, full of gratitude for what Great Britain has done to India,—for its Government which secures us from foreign aggression and ensures security of person and property,—it should not be forgotten for a moment that the real link that binds us indissolubly to England is the hope, the well-founded hope and belief, that with England's help we shall, and, under her guidance alone, we can attain national unity and national freedom. The educational policy of the Government, a policy which combines beneficence with statesmanship, justified such hopes in us. Those hopes were confirmed by various pledges. Those pledges were followed by the creation of institutions by which we were admitted to a share in our ordinary Government which must surely, though slowly, lead to the full fruition of our ambitions.

Just look for a moment at the training we are receiving. From our earliest school-days the great English writers have been our classics.

Englishmen have been our professors in Colleges. English history is taught us in our schools. The books we generally read are English books which describe in detail all the forms of English life, give us all the English types of character. Week after week, English newspapers, journals and magazines pour into India for Indian readers. We, in fact, now live the life of the English. Even the English we write shows not only their turns of thought but also their forms of feeling and thinking. It is impossible under this training not to be penetrated with English ideas, not to acquire English conceptions of duty, of rights, of brotherhood. The study and practice of the law now pursued with such avidity by our people, by familiarising them with reverence for authority and with sentiments of resistance to what is not sanctioned by law, have also materially contributed to the growth of mental independence.

Imbued with these ideas and principles, we naturally desire to acquire the full rights and to share the responsibilities of British citizenship. We have learnt that in the acquisition of those rights and in the recognition of the principles on which they are based, lie the remedy for the evils affecting our country, evils similar to those from which England herself once suffered. We know that in Great Britain race differences between Norman and Saxon, at one period more virulent than those which at any time existed between Hindu and Mahomedan, religious intolerance which has scarcely been surpassed in India, class divisions equaling any in our own country, a degradation, political and social, of the masses which may be equalled here but could never have been exceeded—all these have disappeared in the common struggle for freedom, and in the combined effort to retain it when acquired, in which each required the help of its antagonist and each was obliged to concede to others the right claimed for itself and which, therefore, resulted in the recognition and solemn affirmation of principles of Government, which obliterated all distinctions of race or religion, caste or class. Those principles affirmed the equality of all before law and Government, the right of self-Government by the people themselves through their representatives, and complete freedom of speech and discussion as the very breath of national life. It is the hope that one day we may be admitted as equal sharers in this great inheritance, that we shall have all the civil rights associated with the English Government, that we shall be admitted as freely as Englishmen themselves to worship in this temple of freedom—it is this hope that keeps India and will keep her always attached to the British. This hope is sustained by pledges solemnly made; and the sentiment of loyalty to the British connection created by repeated declarations that we shall be gradually allowed the full rights of English citizenship is

already in full force. Such a pledge was made in 1833 when Parliament solemnly declared that race or religion or colour shall not be a disqualification for holding any appointment. This declaration of policy in a time of peace has been solemnly affirmed after the mutiny. Already, the pledge has been in part redeemed. We have been admitted, as it were, into the outer precincts of the temple of freedom. The press has been enfranchised. Partially elected members sit in our local and legislative councils. We can enter the civil service through the open door of competition. These blessings are no doubt now coupled with conditions which unfortunately detract rom their value. But these great and healthy principles have nurtured and consolidated a sentiment of affection. All that England has to do is to persist resolutely in the line of policy she has initiated and thereby deepen that feeling of loyalty which makes us proud of our connection with England. I myself feel that there is very little reason to fear that England will reverse the past. To deny us the freedom of the press, to deny us representative institutions, she will have to ignore those very principles for which the noblest names in her history have toiled and bled. She cannot close all her educational institutions in the country. She cannot persuade us not to read the fiery denunciations of every illiberal form of Government, of the petty acts of tyranny committed anywhere on the face of the earth, which appear in her papers imported into India week after week. It is impossible to keep out of India eloquent orations on patriotism by men like Mr. Chamberlain—a Cabinet Minister holding up to admiration the memory of patriots like Wallace whose head was struck up on the traitor's gate of the city of London, of Bruce guilty of foul murder in a church, of Emmet and other Irish leaders executed or hung for treason by the English Government. It is impossible to argue a man into slavery in the English language. Thus the only condition requisite for the fruition of our political aspirations is the continuance of the British Rule. The fond hope that India may one day take her place in the confideracy of the free English-speaking nations of the world can be realised only under England's guidance with England's help. Years must elapse, it is true, before our expectations can be realised, before we get representative institutions on the models of those of the English-speaking communities. Slavery we had under our old rulers, Hindu and Mahomedan; we may again get it under any despotic European or Asiatic Government. But we know that real freedom is possible only under the Government of the English nation, nurtured in liberty, hating every form of tyranny, and willing to extend the blessings of representative Government to those capable of using it wisely in the interests of freedom and progress.

Great as is the necessity of British rule for the political emancipation

of our country, even greater is the necessity for social and religious reform. In the present circumstances of India, inhabited as it is by followers of various religions, various sects, classes, very often with antagonistic interests, any Government which is not strictly secular and absolutely impartial must be disastrous to the best interests of the country. The customs, institutions, beliefs, practices of one community are denounced by others as unreasonable and destructive of true faith. Some of our reformers, hopeless of any internal reform, are building up a new social system and accordingly have adopted an attitude so antagonistic to the popular religion that they are regarded as seceders from Hinduism. Others again have formed themselves into sects each claiming to be orthodox and denying to others the merit of adherence to the true Hindu religion. We have also preachers in our midst who while deprecating any revolt or open defiance urge the purification of the Hindu faith. The gulf between Hinduism and other religions has been considered impassable. But attempts are being made with some success to re-admit converts into Hinduism. Steps are being taken in some places to mitigate the rancour of religious hostility between Hindus and Mahomedans. Some of the lower castes resent the galling yoke of caste so bitterly that they seek refuge in Mahomedanism or Christianity. The original four castes had multiplied into a number that must appear to every man unreasonable and absurd. There seems to be a general desire to break down the barriers between these numerous castes. Knowledge is accessible to all. The Vedas and other holy books are now common property; equality in knowledge must eventually lead to the practical removal, if not the entire destruction of the great barriers that now divide the various classes. Again, you are aware of the attempts that are being made to restore our women to the position which competent authorities maintain they occupied in ancient India. We want in brief to eliminate, if necessary from our system all that stands in the way of progress. We desire to absorb and assimilate into our own what appears good to us in western civilization. This is impossible under a Government which would uphold a particular social system or a particular form of religion to the exclusion of others as some of the ancient Governments of India did. To break down the isolation of the Hindu religion, to remove the barriers which now prevent free social intercourse and unity of action, to extend the blessings of education to the lower classes, to improve the position of women to one of equality to men, we require the continuance of a strictly secular Government in thorough sympathy with liberal thought and progress.

Gentlemen, I do not propose to refer to the various subjects that we have been continually pressing on the attention of our Government and of the public. This year, Mr. Dadabhai Naoroji and our four Indian witnesses

have stated our grievances before the Welby Commission with a fulness and clearness which leave nothing to be desired. They have stood the test of cross-examination by those who have constituted themselves the advocates of Indian Government and their evidence will remain on record as a protest against some of the shortcomings of British administration. Our thanks are due to them.

I shall accordingly content myself with referring to certain notable events of this year. Naturally, the terrible famine that has devastated our country first claims our attention. We render our hearty thanks for the magnificent aid received by us from the people of Great Britain and other countries. We recognize the great sympathy and ability with which the famine administration was carried on in India. But we cannot shut our eyes to the fact that the same energy, if directed to discover and remove the causes of famine would be of far greater benefit to the country. At the root of these famines is the great poverty of India. The Madras Board of Revenue recently estimated on the returns furnished by local officials with reference to ryotwary tracts, that, in a season described as generally favourable for agricultural operations, there was no grain in the presidency for five out of a population of 28 millions. If this is true, the miserable state of the people with regard to food supply in seasons less favourable may be easily conceived. For ourselves, it is unnecessary to rely upon Government estimates and returns. The poverty of the country reveals itself to us in every direction, in every shape and form. It shows itself in the poor condition of the labouring population and of the great majority of ryots who are under-fed, and who are without, not only the comforts, but even the absolute necessaries of life and who lead a life of penury and toil unredeemed by any hope of provision against the frequent vicissitudes of the seasons, sickness or old age when they must be dependent on relatives or strangers. The once well-to-do ryots are becoming reduced to the position of poor tenants, their poverty preventing them from carrying on any cultivation that requires capital. Parents find it difficult to give their children the education which their profession or station in life demands or indeed any education necessary wherewith to earn their livelihood; the extreme poverty of the class to which the majority of students belong could easily be ascertained. Even a partial failure of crops in one year leads to terrible scarcity or famine. Famine at certain intervals of time is becoming a normal condition of things in India. In 1877 and again this year, the loss of life has been terrible. Each succeeding famine finds the staying power of the masses particularly in the ryotwary Districts reduced. Is this state of things to continue for

ever? Are we not entitled, are not those who so generously come to our help entitled to ask the responsible Government, whether any steps have been taken to prevent a recurrence of the famine. In a fertile country, with every variety of claim capable of producing every variety of product, with a population thrifty and hard working, if the produce is not sufficient for the population, it must be due to some defect in the system of administration which does not protect the fruits of industry but scares away capital from the land. If the produce of the country is sufficient for the population and yet as a fact the food stock remaining in the country does not suffice for consumption, the state of things must be due to some enormous drain on the resources of the country. The feeling is gaining ground, that the Government is morally reponsible for the extreme poverty of the masses, for the scarcity that prevails almost every year in some part of the country or other, for the famine that so frequently desolates the land and claims more victims and creates more distress than under any civilized Government anywhere else in the world. The flippancy that would dismiss the entire problem from consideration with the remark that all this is due to over-population and is irremediable, is as dangerous as is the deep-rooted belief that distress is a visitation of Providence for the sins of our rulers. One great Viceroy has had the question under consideration, and to him the remedy in so far as the increase in wealth from the land is concerned was clear. It is permanent settlement of Government Revenue from the land. The settlement officer will not then increase the Revenue and deprive the cultivator of the increased produce due to his labour, or his capital. Labour and capital will then be attracted to the cultivation of the land. There will be a large increase in the agricultural produce in India. There will always be a large reserve of food stocks in the country available in times of scarcity. The fixity of taxation will create a class of land holders interested in the maintenance of law and order. The policy of Government was once settled in favor of permanency, but in recent years under pressure of, mainly, military expenditure the policy has been changed and the revenue enormously raised. Our Government ought to concede the permanent settlement immediately to all parts of India and in those parts of India where from local circumstances a permanent limitation of land revenue is not feasible, it would be a step in the right direction if any increased demand for revenue by Executive action is permitted only with the permission of the Legislative Council. This would not be an adequate remedy, but it is a measure that will help to produce great and satisfactory results.

The next remedy that obviously suggests itself has reference to expenditure. Government agencies are notoriously extravagant, at least in the

opinion of those who have to find the money, and the foreign policy of the Indian Government imposes a burden on the tax-payer which is already becoming too heavy to bear. The checks that exist are not sufficiently effective. The Budgets at present are only offered for criticism. They ought to be submitted to the Legislative Councils for approval and the members ought to have the power of moving resolutions in connection with them. As the officials always form the majority, Government could never be embarassed by an adverse vote, whereas in its differences of opinion with the Home Government, a resolution of the Legislative Council could naturally be a great support to it. The biggest item of expenditure is the Military expenditure. Our true policy is a peaceful policy. We have little if anything, to expect from conquests. With such capacity for internal development as our country possesses, with such crying need to carry out the reforms absolutely necessary for our well-being, we want a period of prolonged peace. We have no complaint against our neighbours, either on our north-west or our north-east frontier. If ever our country is involved in war, it will be due to the policy of aggrandizement of the English Government at London or Calcutta. An army is maintained at our cost far in excess of what is required for us. The military element is supreme in the Viceroy's Council. For interests other than Indian, countries are invaded, all the horrors of war let loose at the expense of the Indian taxpayer. As England directs our foreign policy and as wars are undertaken to maintain English rule, the English treasury ought to pay the entire cost, claiming contribution from India to the extent of India's interest in the struggle. This would secure a thorough discussion of any foreign policy in the British Parliament. It would also enable Indian members in the Viceroy's Council to protest against any unfair distribution of the war expenditure when the Budget has to be passed.

It is also to be borne in mind that a large portion of this unnecessary expenditure is due to the recognition, not perhaps openly in words, but in acts and policy by Government of the idea that the English are a foreign and superior race holding India by the sword and that the Indians are, as a rule, not worthy of trust and confidence. To us this idea is hateful and therefore we insist upon equality before law and Government. We maintain that no distinction ought to be made between classes or races, that the Queen's proclamation should be adhered to, and therefore we protest against the principl underlying the Arms Act whereby no native of India may possess or carrya arms without special license while Europeans and Eurasians may bear arms-unquestioned. We appeal to our Government to authorize a system of volunteering for Indians and not confine it practically to Europeans and

Eurasians thereby creating and fostering class prejudices. For the same reason we demand that the military service in its higher grades should not be restricted to Europeans alone but should be practically opened to the natives of this country and that colleges be established for training them for the military career. On the same ground we press for admission into the Public service on an equal footing with Europeans. Apart from economic necessity, the stability and permanence of British connection require that not only no positve disqualification should exist but that the rules intended to make the declarations of 1833 and the Queen's promise of 1858 a dead letter must be removed. For, the Civil Service, the Police, the Forest Service, the Salt Service, and even the Educational Service rules are framed apparently on the assumption that a European is by mere reason of his nationality fit and an Indian for the same reason is unfit for the higher appointments in those services.

The concession of these demands means an enormous increase in India's defensive strength against any foe ; it means a reduction in taxation which at the rate it is now growing, must involve the ruin of the country. These distinctions on the other hand cast a slur on our loyalty, accentuate race prejudices in a most invidious form and relegate Indians to the position of an inferior race and silently ensure the emasculation of our manhood. The disastrous consequences of this race question are already apparent. Englishmen and other European Colonists in South Africa and Australia refuse to treat us on terms of equality and justify their refusal on account of our degraded position in our own country. On the other hand,a section, I hope a very small section, of our fellow-subjects regards a foreign power of its own religion following a course of policy apparently abhorrent to the conscience of the English public, with feelings which, though unconsciously, took their origin in the refusal of Englishmen to treat them as fellow-citizens in reality and nto merely in name. To this feeling of race superiority is also due the frequent contemptuous treatment of respectable people by soldiers, a treatment which renders them a terror to peaceful inhabitants and which according to the confessions apparently believed by Government has led to the Poona tragedy. The racial feeling I refer to, is confirmed by the belief generally entertained in India that it is almost impossible to secure the conviction of a European accused of any heinous offence. If that feeling is justified by the action of our authorities, then the position is deplorable. If the impression is unwarranted, then its origin must be due to the idea of inequality before law generally entertained. On this race question, no concession is possible. No compromise can be accepted so far as it lies in us. We must insist on perfect equality. Inequality means race

inferiority, national abasement. Acquisition, therefore, of all civil rights conferred on Englishmen, removal of all disabilities on Indians as such—these must be our aim.

I shall now briefly refer to he Poona plague operations and their unfortunate developments. This country was passing through a terrible ordeal. Poverty which may be said to be the normal condition of our masses deepened into famine. In the Bombay Presidency, it was followed by Plague, a terrible disease to which no remedy has yet been discovered. The measures which the Government had to take for its suppression in Poona which was badly affected were said to have interfered with the domestic habits of the Hindus and Mahomedans; soldiers who were employed to enforce these Government measures were rightly or wrongly, generally believed to have insulted women and defiled places of worship. The result was prostration of the people. A feeling of helplessness came over them. In Western countries, the result would have been lawlessness, In Poona, many contented themselves with abandoning their homes. Some resigned themselves to sullen apathy and despair. There were a few who protested against Government measures, pointing out their unnecessary harshness. Amongst those who protested was Mr. Natu, a leading Poona Sardar. His formal written complaints recently published in England disclose, if any reliance can be placed on them, a state of affairs which certainly demanded attention. Let me give you a brief summary of his complaints.

The inspection of houses by soldiers seems to have been carried out without notice by forcing open, very often unnecessarily when there were other means of entrance, the locks of the shops and the houses when the owners were absent and absolutely no attempt was made to protect the properties or the house. No notice was taken of complaints concerning them. A Hindu lady was assaulted by a soldier and Mr. Natu reported the matter to the authorities producing the witnesses. No notice was vouchsafed. The soldiers were refractory and any complaint against them was obstruction. When a man fell ill many neigbouring families were taken to the segregation camp and left there without any covering to protect their body or any furniture, their property at home including horses, cows and sheep being left unprotected. A man was unnecessaily taken to the hospital and sent back as not being affected by plague to find his furniture destroyed and his poor wife and relatives forcibly removed and detained in the segregation camp. Temples were defiled by soldiers and his own temple was entered by them on account, Natu believes, of his impertinence in making a complaint. An old man

who succeeded in satisfying the search party that he was not suffering from plague was detained in jail some hours for having obstructed the search party, the obstruction apparently consisting in the delay caused by him. Insult was the reward for the services of volunteers and their suggestions were treated with contumely. You all know how sensitive our Mahomedan fellow-subjects are about the privacy of their women. And when Mr. Natu suggested that the services of Mahomedan volunteers should be availed of, to search the Mahomedan quarter, he was told that his conduct was improper and his services voluntarily rendered were dispensed with. Mr. Natu brought all this to the notice of the officials, pointed out that the operations were carried on against the spirit of the rules and complained that there was a great amount of unrest. The Indian newspapers gave prominence to these and similar complaints. They compared the English Government to other Governments very much to the disadvantage of the former. *The Mahratta* complained : " Plague is more merciful to us than its human prototypes now reigning in the city. "... .. The tyranny of the Plague Committee and its chosen instruments is yet too brutal to allow respectable people to breathe at ease. " And it was added that " every one of these grievances may be proved to the hilt if His Excellency is pleased to enquire into the details ." These representations were certainly entitled to attentive consideration however much the authorities might have disagreed with them. Their objects were honest, their methods were proper. Their language was not respectful, it was perhaps violent, but men dominated by feelings of distress are often carried beyond what strict prudence would dictate. The violence seems to have been proportionate to the contempt with which the complaints were treated. But to the Indian mind the idea of creating a feeling of disaffection with a view to overthrow the English Government is simply ludicrous. Language which to a lawyer savoured perhaps of sedition was only intended by its violence to attract attention, and such language was only caused by the bitter feeling, that milder representations by a race not so law-abiding as the Indians would have received immediate and careful attention. However, while these plague operations were being carried out, the President of the Plague Committee to the horror and alarm of the native community, was murdered on what happened to be the Jubilee celebration day. To the Indian mind it was clear that this was nothing more than an unfortunate coincidence.

But its effect was very different in certain quarters. An Englishman in India is in a strange world; with his energy, practical will and idea of freedom, he fails to understand and perhaps despises a nation given up to metaphysical dreams which does not regard material prosperity as the great ob-

ject of life. In other parts of the world under European sway, in Africa and America an alliance with a European is eagerly sought, while in India where also he is master, he is regarded by the castes as impure whose touch is pollution. With such differences in thought and feeling, no wonder that ordinary Englishmen ignore the people entirely and do not try to understand them. Hence their limited comprehension. Not knowing the native mind they exaggerate the importance of trifles which only ruffle the surface of native feeling, and attribute to certain events a significance which however justifiable in England do not even deserve a passing notice in India. The difficulties of English administration based on this misunderstanding are increased by misrepresentations. Labouring under this incapacity to discover the mental condition of the Indian masses, the Anglo-Indian papers are not generally safe guides. In times of excitement in particular, some of them prove positively mischievous.

Thus, it is not a matter for surprise that a section of the Anglo-Indian Press discovered a deep design in the Poona murder. They found a pretext for the murder in the plague measures taken by Government. That the Native Press denounced such measures confirmed their suspicion. That the murder took place on the day of a great world-wide rejoicing proved to their satisfaction a deep-laid conspiracy which could have been planned only by educated cunning. Almost every incident that took place in Poona was pressed into the service to support this theory of conspiracy, and an attack was commenced on the Vernacular Press and the educated Indians, perhaps unexampled in its virulence since the mutiny ; a gaggaing act was loudly demanded, the policy of imparting education to the Indians was questioned, the press in England was worked, and the Europeans were thrown into a panic. The attack on the educated Indians and the Vernacular Press was brutal and cowardly. It was suggested as a matter for regret that the native mind had forgotten the lessons of the last mutiny, that a fresh mutiny would clear the air, particularly as the Mahrattas were not in the show of 1857. It was insisted that the Native Press was seditious and was responsible for the murder, and a section of the Anglo-Indian Press demanded the punishment by name, of Mr. Tilak, the man who had strongly attacked and denounced the measures of Government. The unreasoning panic into which the Anglo-Indian community was driven by this malignant attack and its unfortunate success in inflaming the English public, forced, according to the English papers, the hands of the Secretary of Stage, and Lord Sandhurst had to take measures which, it is believed, he would never have sanctioned if he had remained a free agent. Ostensibly to discover the murderer, but

acting on the theory that the murders were the result of a conspiracy for which the Vernacular Press was responsible, the Government arrested the Natu brothers under the provisions of an old law intended for lawless times to secure the peace of the country. Mr. Tilak and the Editors of two Vernacular papers were prosecuted ; and a punitive force was imposed on the Poona Municipality. The arrest of the Natu brothers was and must remain a great blunder. It recalls the worst days of irresponsible despotism. Liberty of person and property is a farce if you are liable to be arrested, imprisoned, and your property sequestered at the will and pleasure of Government without being brought to trial. We shall before we part, I have no doubt, express our emphatic protest against this proceeding.

The Editor of one of the papers was tried by a Judge without a Jury and was convicted and sentenced to a term of imprisonment which can be explained only by the panic which seized the entire European community. Mr. Tilak was tried by a Judge and Jury. A European,—he need not even be a subject of the Empress,—may claim to be tried by a jury of whom at least one half shall be Europeans. This is practically an efficient protection not only against the executive but against popular excitement. In the case of an Indian, the entire Anglo-Indian community may be most unreasonably and passionately prejudiced against him ; he may be an object of violent antipathy to the other races ; yet he cannot claim fair trial at the hands of his countrymen. He must submit to be quietly convicted after, it may be, the farce, of a trial; for a trial seldom restrains men who are passionately excited, and the trial by jury, an institution intended for the protection of the prisoner in such circumstances proves a delusion and a snare by depriving the prisoner of the right of appeal. Mr. Tilak, there can be scarcely any doubt, would have claimed a trial by a jury of whom one half were Indians, if to the Indian the law allowed the same protection that it affords to the European. If there is any offence in India which ought to be tried by a native jury, it is the offence of sedition. It was possible that a native Jury who knew the language and who were ina more favourable position to form a correct judgment of the probable and intended effect of the articles on native mind would not have convicted ; it was certain that a European Jury in that state of public excitement would convict. By exercising its right of challenge the prosecution was able to secure a Jury of six Europeans—the number necessary to secure a conviction—and three Indians, and the verdict was naturally 6 to 3. In a far stronger case tried by an experienced Chief Justice who had been trained in English courts, and retained the instincts of an Englishman, the Judge refused to accept the verdict of 7 to 2, when there was only one native on

the Jury. In prison, these men, after conviction, have been treated as ordinary criminals. You are perhaps aware that, in England, a man convicted of sedition is not treated as an ordinary criminal, sedition being regarded a political offence, but in India apparently one is subject to the ordinary hardships of prison life.

This Poona incident enforces the necessity of ceaseless vigilances in keeping the English public correctly informed of whatever passes in India and of thus counteracting the mischievous effects of the dissemination of incorrect news. It emphasises the necessity of extending the system of Trial by Jury to India on the same conditions as it is granted to Europeans. It also shows that the Executive Government can deprive us of our liberty of person and property at its own will and pleasure. It has brought into disagreeable prominence the unsatisfactory nature of the law of sedition. The Government of India have announced their intention to altèr such law in the light of recent events. We trust the Government will bear in mind that in the circumstances of this country, anything which checks freedom of public discussion is most deplorable. Such check may become a temporary, if dangerous bar to quiet and steady progress. The stream of our national progress will nevertheless move on. It will become dry only when our holy rivers of India become dry. Its progress at present under sympathetic guidance is smooth. Its unwise obstruction may compel underground passages or its overflow. It is a sad commentary on a century of British rule that a Vernacular paper has had to close its office with these words :—
" It is no more now-a-days safe to conduct newspapers, hence we, who have other means of livelihood to support, make our exit, and do not feel any more necessity of attending the Deputy Commissioner's Bungalow to offer explanations for certain writings."

Though the Press prosecutions are over, the Government has not answered the question that will be asked by posterity, and that is being asked by India now. Was there any foundation for the complaints made by these various men, some of them honorably distinguished ? Why have they been led to commit those acts which have now been declared to be offences ? If they are not justified, if they cannot prove their allegations, they cannot be condemned too strongly ; they will then have proved a curse to our country for the mischief they have committed. If, on the other hand, it was a righteous indignation for the sufferings of their countrymen that led them to jail, it will be difficult to blame those who extend their sympathy to them,

We deprecate most strongly any intemperate language in criticizing Government measures. We are bound to assume that any objectionable

measure must have been due either to ignorance or to error of judgment. We have also to remember that after all our salvation lies in bringing home to the majority of the people of England our real wishes and feelings and that the persons whose actions are criticized are their own kith and kin, that the system of Government we attack was framed by men for whom they feel just respect and esteem. Any violence therefore will do us infinite harm, it may possibly prevent us from securing a hearing. A false, incorrect, or even doubtful allegation will discredit us in the eyes of Englishmen, and the cause of reform may be thereby put back for generations.

Let me say at once that in the remarks I make I deem it superfluous to proclaim our loyalty to the British throne or constitution, or to add that we have not the slightest sympathy with any speech or writing which would regard a severance of our connexion as a desirable consummation. We naturally take a pride in the lives of the great men who have lived for India, and we would draw the attention of our rulers to that part of our ancient history which we think they might usefully study. But we are also aware that the present has its roots in the past and the past is responsible for our lowly condition. We who claim equality at the hands of Englishme nwould deplore and resist any attempt to revive the days when any caste or class as such was privileged before the law, when a Brahmin for instance, could claim immunity from punishment! We claim equality for all, Brahmins and Pariahs alike. It is this same feeling that prompts our criticism of any act on the part of our Rulers which may seem to recognize any inequality. It is by the removal of these inequalities before law between European and Indian and by the degree of self-Government conceded to us that we measure our progress towards freedom.

Gentlemen, I have done. I am afraid I have wearied you with my lengthy remarks, but I hope I have succeeded in placing before you clearly some points relating to our present political condition. We have no need to despair of our political future so long as we depend upon Great Britain, but let us at the same time be alive to our duties and responsibilities. India expects great things from us; the whole civilized world is watching the changes coming over us. Shall we be content to leave India as it is, or shall we go on and do all in our power to lift it to a higher level. Years of subjection, nay, we may even say servitude have sapped the strength of the Indian nation, dwarfed its growth, and stripped it of all that was grand and noble in it, and if India is ever to occupy a better position than she fills at the present moment and take her proper place in the scale of nations, it must be entirely due to the zealous efforts of her educated and enlightened

sons. Let '*Nil desperandum*' be our motto; let not 'insidious smile or angry frown' deter us from following the straight path of duty; and with the welfare and progress of our land as our end and aim, let us endeavour under a solemn sense of responsibility as well as loyalty to our country, to bring about that glorious future which must inevitably crown our efforts.

PART III.

Appendix.

APPENDIX A.

Resolutions passed at each Congress.

First Congress—Bombay—1885.

1. That this Congress earnestly recommends that the promised inquiry into the working of the Indian Administration, here and in England, should be entrusted to a Royal Commission, the people of India being adequately represented thereon, and evidence taken both in India and in England.

2. That this Congress considers the abolition of the Council of the Secretary of State for India, as at present constituted, the necessary preliminary to all other reforms.

3. That this Congress considers the reform and expansion of the Supreme and existing Local Legislative Councils, by the admission of a considerable proportion of elected members (and the creation of similar Councils for the North-Western Provinces and Oudh, and also for the Punjab) essential; and holds that all Budgets should be referred to these Councils for consideration, their members being moreover empowered to interpellate the Executive in regard to all branches of the administration; and that a Standing Committee of the House of Commons should be constituted to receive and consider any formal protests that may be recorded by majorities of such Councils against the exercise by the Executive of the power which would be vested in it, of overruling the decisions of such majorities.

4. That, in the opinion of this Congress, the competitive examinations now held in England for first appointments in various civil departments of the public service should henceforth, in accordance with the views of the India Office Committee of 1860, "be held simultaneously, one in England and one in India, both being as far as practicable identical in their nature, and those who compete in both countries being finally classified in one list according to merit," and that the successful candidates in India should be sent to England for further study, and subjected there to such further examinations as may seem needful. Further, that all other first appointments (excluding peonships and the like) should be filled by competitive examinations held in India, under conditions calculated to secure such intellectual, moral, and physical qualifications as may be decided by Government to be necessary. Lastly, that the maximum age of candidates for entrance into the Covenanted Civil Service be raised to not less than 23 years.

5. That in the opinion of this Congress, the proposed increase in the military expenditure of the empire is unnecessary, and, regard being had to the revenues of the empire and the existing circumstances of the country, excessive.

6. That in the opinion of this Congress, if the increased demands for military expenditure are not to be, as they ought to be, met by retrenchment, they ought to be met, firstly, by the re-imposition of the Customs duties; and, secondly, by the extension of the license tax to those classes of the community, official and non-official, at present exempted from it, care being taken that in the case of all classes a sufficiently high taxable minimum be maintained. And, further, that this Congress is of opinion that Great Britain should extend an imperial guarantee to the Indian debt.

7. That this Congress deprecates the annexation of Upper Burmah, and considers that if the Goverment unfortunately decide on annexation, the entire country of Burmah should be separated from the Indian Viceroyalty and constituted a Crown Colony, as distinct in all matters from the Government of the country as is Ceylon.

8. That the resolutions passed by this Congress be communicated to the Political Associations in each province, and that these Associations be requested, with the help of similar bodies and other agencies, within their respective provinces, to adopt such measures as they may consider calculated to advance the settlement of the various questions dealt with in these resolutions.

9. That the Indian National Congress re-resemble next year in Calcutta and sit on Tuesday, the 28th of December, 1886, and the next succeeding days.

Second Congress—Calcutta—1886.

---

1. That this Congress of Delegates from all parts of India do humbly offer its dutiful and loyal congratulations to Her Most Gracious Majesty, the Queen-Empress, on the approaching completion of the first half century of her memorable, beneficent and glorious reign, and heartily wish her many, many more, and happy years of rule over the great British Empire.

2. That this Congress regards with the deepest sympathy, and views with grave apprehension, the increasing poverty of vast numbers of the population of India and (although aware that the Government is not overlooking this matter and is contemplating certain palliatives) desires to record its fixed conviction that the introduction of Representative Institutions will prove one of the most important practical steps towards the amelioration of the condition of the pepole.

3. That this Congress do, emphatically, re-affirm the 3rd Resolution of the Congress of 1885, and distinctly declare its belief that the reform and expansion of the Council of the Governor-General for making laws and of the Provincial Legislative Councils therein suggested, have now become essential alike in the interests of India and England.

4. That this Congress is of opinion that, in giving practical effect to this essential reform, regard should be had (subject to such modifications as, on a more detailed examination of the question, may commend themselves to the Government) to the principles embodied in the following tentative suggestions :—

(1.) The number of persons composing the Legislative Councils, both provincial and of the Governor-General, to be materially increased. Not less than one-half the Members of such enlarged Council to be elected. Not more than one-fourth to be officials having seats *ex-officio* in such Councils and not more than one-fourth to be Members, official or non-official, nominated by Government.

(2.) The right to elect Members to the Provincial Councils, to be conferred only on those classes and members of the community, *primâ facie* capable of exercising it wisely and independently. In Bengal and Bombay, the Councillors may be elected by the members of Municipalities, District Boards, Chambers of Commerce and the Universities, or an electorate may be constituted of all persons possessing such qualifications, educational and pecuniary, as may be deemed necessary. In Madras, the Councillors may be elected either by District Boards, Municipalities, Chambers of Commerce and the University, or by Electoral Colleges composed of Members partly elected by these bodies and partly nominated by Government. In the North-West Provinces and Oudh and in the Punjab, Councillors may be elected by an Electoral College composed of Members elected by Municipal and District Boards, and nominated, to an extent not exceeding one-sixth of the total number, by Government, it being understood that the same elective system now in force where Municipal Boards are concerned will be applied to District Boards and the right of electing Members to

these latter extended to the cultivating class. But whatever system be adopted (and the details must be worked out separately for each province) care must be taken that all sections of the Community and all great interests are adequately represented.

(3.) The elected Members of the Council of the Governor-General for making laws, to be elected by the elected Members of the several Provincial Councils.

(4.) No elected or nominated Member of any Council to receive any salary or remuneration in virtue of such Membership, but any such Member, already in receipt of any Government salary or allowance, to continue to draw the same unchanged during Membership, and all Members to be entitled to be reimbursed any expenses incurred in travelling in connection with their Membership.

(5.) All persons resident in India, to be eligible for seats in Council, whether as electees or nominees, without distinction of race, creed, caste or colour.

(6.) All legislative measures and all financial questions, including, all budgets whether these involve new or enhanced taxation or not, to be necessarily submitted to and dealt with by these Councils. In the case of all other branches of the administration any Member to be at liberty, after due notice, to put any question he sees fit to the *ex-officio* Members (or such one of these as may be especially charged with the supervision of the particular branch concerned) and to be entitled (except as hereinafter provided) to receive a reply to his question, together with copies of any paper requisite for the thorough comprehension of the subject, and on this reply the Council to be at liberty to consider and discuss the question, and record thereon such resolution as may appear fitting to the majority. Provided that, if the subject in regard to which the inquiry is made involves matters of Foreign policy, Military dispositions or strategy, or is otherwise of such a nature that, in the opinion of the Executive, the public interests would be materially imperilled by the communication of the information asked for, it shall be competent for them to instruct the *ex-officio* Members, or one of them, to reply accordingly, and decline to furnish the information asked for.

(7.) The Executive Government shall possess the power of overruling the decision arrived at by the majority of the Council, in every case in which, in its opinion the public interests would suffer by the acceptance of such decision; but whenever this power is exercised, a full exposition of the grounds on which this has been considered necessary, shall be published within one month and in the case of local Governments they shall report the circumstances and explain their action to the Government of India, and in the case of this latter, it shall report and explain to the Secretary of State; and in any such case on a representation made through the Government of India and the Secretary of State by the overruled majority, it shall be competent to the Standing Committee of the House of Commons (recommended in the 3rd Resolution of last year's Congress which this present Congress has affirmed) to consider the matter, and call for any and all papers or information, and hear any persons on behalf of such majority or otherwise, and thereafter, if needful, report thereon to the full House.

5. That this Congress do invite all Public bodies and all Associations throughout the country, humbly and earnestly, to entreat His Excellency the Viceroy to obtain the sanction of Her Majesty's Secretary of State for India, to the appointment of a Commission

to enquire exhaustively into the best method of introducing such a tentative form of Representative Institutions into India, as has been indicated in Resolutions III. of the past, and IV. of the present year's Congress.

6. That a Committee composed of the gentlemen named below be appointed to consider the Public Service Question and report thereon to this Congress.

Hon'ble Dadabhai Naoroji (*Bombay*). Hon'ble S. Subramania Iyer (*Madras*). Hon'ble Peary Mohun Mookerjee (*Calcutta*) Mr. G. Subramania Iyer (*Madras*), Babu Motilal Ghose (*Calcutta*) Mr. Surendra Nath Banerjee (*Calcutta*) Mr. Gungapershad Varma (*Lucknow*) Mr. Ramkali Chaudhuri (*Benares*) Mr. Guru Prasad Sen (*Patna*). Pundit Prannath (*Lucknow*). Munshi Kashipershad (*Allahabad*). Nawab Reza Ali Khan (*Lucknow.*) Mr. Hamid Ali, (*Lucknow*) Lala Kanhylal (*Amritsar*) Rao Sahib Gangadhar Rao Madhaw Chitnavis (*Nagpur*). Mr. Rahimatulla M. Sayani (*Bombay.*)

7. That this Congress approves and adopts the report* submitted by the Committee appointed by Resolution VI.

**Report*.*

We, the Members of the Committee appointed by the Congress to submit a statement in connection with the Public Service Question, have the honor to report that the following resolutions were unanimously adopted by us at a meeting held yesterday :—

1. That the open Competitive Examination be held simultaneously both in India and in England.

2. That the Simultaneous Examinations thus held be equally open to all classes of Her Majesty's subjects.

3. That the Classified lists be prepared according to merit.

4. That the Congress express the hope that the Civil Service Commissioners will give fair consideration to Sanskrit and Arabic among the subjects of examination.

5. That the age of candidates eligible for admission to the open Competitive Examination be not less than 19, nor, as recommended by Sir C. Aitchison, more than 23 years.

6. That Simultaneous Examinations being granted, the Statutory Civil Service be closed for first appointments.

7. That the appointments in the Statutory Civil Service, under the existing rules, be still left open to the Members of the Uncovenanted Service and to professional men of proved merit and ability.

8. That all appointments requiring educational qualifications, other than covenanted first appointments, be filled by Competitive Examinations held in the different Provinces, and open in each Province to such natural-born subjects of H. M. only as are residents thereof.

These Resolutions, it is hoped, cover the main principles which underlie the questions set by the Public Service Commission. For a more detailed consideration there was no time.

(Sd.) DADABHAI NAOROJI,

30th December, 1886. *President of the Committee.*

8. That, in the opinion of this Congress, the time has now arrived when the system of trial by jury may be safely extended into many parts of the country where it is not at present in force.

9. That, in the opinion of this Congress, the innovation made in 1872 in the system of trial by jury, depriving the verdicts of juries of all finality, has proved injurious to the country, and that the powers then, for the first time, vested in Sessions Judges and High Courts, of setting aside verdicts of acquittal, should be at once withdrawn.

10. That, in the opinion of this Congress, a provision, similar to that contained in the Summary Jurisdiction Act of England (under which, accused persons, in serious cases, have the

option of demanding a committal to the Sessions Court), should be introduced into the Indian Code of Procedure, enabling accused persons, in warrant cases, to demand that, instead of being tried by the Magistrate, they be committed to the Court of Sessions.

11. That this Congress do place on record an expression of the universal conviction that a complete separation of executive and judicial functions (such that in no case the two functions shall be combined in the same officer) has become an urgent necessity, and that, in its opinion, it behoves the Government to effect this separation without further delay, even though this should, in some Provinces, involve some extra expenditure.

12. That, in view of the unsettled state of public affairs in Europe, and the immense assistance that the people of this country, if duly prepared therefor, are capable of rendering to Great Britain in the event of any serious complications arising, this Congress do earnestly appeal to the Government to authorise (under such rules and restrictions as may to it seem fitting) a system of Volunteering for the Indian inhabitants of the country, such as may qualify them to support the Government effectively in any crisis.

13. That Standing Congress Committees be constituted at all important centres.

14. That the Third Indian National Congress assemble at Madras on the 27th of December 1887.

15. That, copies of these Resolutions be forwarded to His Excellencythe Viceroy-in-Council, with the humble requests that he will cause the 1st Resolution to be submitted in due course to Her Majesty the Queen-Empress, that he will cause all the Resolutions to be laid before Her Majesty's Secretary of State for India, and that he himself will be graciously pleased in consultation with his colleagues, to accord them his best consideration.

Third Congress—Madras—1887.

1. That a Committee consisting of the following gentlemen be appointed, to consider what rules, if any, may now be usefully framed in regard to the constitution and working of the Congress, with instuctions to report thereon to the Congress, on the 30th instant.

Messrs. Namjoshi, Chandravaker, Mir Humayun Jah Bahadur, Hajee Mahomed Abdul Shakoor Badshaw Sahib, S. Subramania Iyer, W. S. Gantz, Rangiah Naidu, Surendranath Banerjee, Trailokhyanoth Mitra, Kali Charn Banerjee, Guru Prasad Sen, Saligram Singh, Ram Kali Chaudhuri, Hafiz Abdul Rahim, Rampal Singh, Pandit Madan Mohun, Ganga Prasad Varma, Bishan Narayen Dar, Hamid Ali, Murlidhur, Satyanand Agnihotri, H. H. Dhruva, W. C. Bonnerjee, Norendranath Sen, Eardley Norton, Joy Govind Shome, Iswori Lal Sircar, G. Subramania Iyer, D. A. Khare, S. A. Saminada Iyer, Sabapthy Mudaliar, A. O. Hume, C. Vijiya Raghava Chariar, Govind Buksh, Karandikar

2. That this Congress re-affirms the necessity for the expansion and reform of the Council of the Governor-General for making Laws, and the Provincial Legislative Councils, already set forth in Resolutions III. of the Congress of 1885 and 1886, and expresses the earnest hope that the Government will no longer delay action in the direction of this essential reform.

3. That this Congress once again places on record an expression of the universal conviction that a complete separation of the Executive and Judicial functions (such that in no case the two functions shall be combined in the same officer) has become an urgent necessity, and declares that, in its opinion, it behoves the Government to effect this separation without further delay, even though this should, in some Provinces, involve some extra expenditure.

4. That, in view of the loyalty of her Majesty's Indian subjects, this Congress considers it desirable that the Queen's Proclamation should be given effect to ; that the Military Service in its higher grades should be practically opened to the natives of this country ; and that the Government of India should establish Military Colleges in this country, whereat the

natives of India, as defined by Statute, may be educated and trained for a military career as officers of the Indian Army.

5. That, in view of the unsettled state of public affairs in Europe and the immense assistance that the people of this country, if duly prepared, therefor, are capable of rendering to Great Britain, in the event of any serious complications arising, this Congress once again earnestly appeals to the Government to authorize (under such rules and restrictions as may to it seem fitting,) a system of Volunteering for the Indian inhabitants of the country, such as may qualify them to support the Government, effectively, in any crisis.

6. That, as the administration of the Income-Tax, especially as regards incomes below Rs. 1,000, has proved extremely unsatisfactory, it is essential, in the opinion of the Congress, that the taxable minimum be raised to Rs. 1,000, the loss of revenue thus involved being made good, and further financial difficulties, if any, met by reductions in the existing public expenditure, or, should this prove impossible, by the re-imposition of an import duty on the finer classes of cotton goods.

7. That, having regard to the poverty of the people, it is desirable that the Government be moved to elaborate a system of Technical Education, suitable to the condition of the country, to encourage indigenous manufactures by a more strict observance of the orders, already existing, in regard to utilizing such manufactures for State purposes, and to employ more extensively, than at present, the skill and talents of the people of the country.

8. That, in view of the loyalty of the people, the hardships which the present Arms' Act (XI of 1878) causes, and the unmerited slur which it casts upon the people of this country, the Government be moved so to modify the provisions of Chapter IV., and if necessary, other portions of the said Act, as to enable all persons to possess and wear arms, unless debarred therefrom, either as individuals or members of particular communities or classes, by the orders of the Government of India (or any local authority empowered by the Government of India on that behalf) for reasons to be recorded in writing and duly published.

9. That the rules drafted by the Commitee appointed under Resolution I. stand over for consideraton till next Congress, but that, in the meantime, copies be circulated to all Standing Congress Committees, with the request that they will, during the coming year, act in accordance with these rules, so far as this may seem to them possible and desirable, and report thereon to the next Congress, with such further suggestions as to them may seem meet.

10. That the Fourth Indian National Congress assemble at Allahabad on the 26th December, 1888.

11. That copies of these Resolutions be forwaded to His Excellency the Viceroy-in-Council, with humble request that he will cause all the Resolutions to be laid before Her Majesty's Secretary of State for India, and that he himself will be graciously pleased, in consultation with his colleagues, to accord them his best considaration.

Fourth Congress—Allahabad—1888.

---

1. That this Congress affirms the necessity for the expansion and reform of the Council of the Governor-General for making laws and regulations, and of the existing Provincial Legislative Councils, already set forth in Resolutions III. of the Congress of 1885 and 1886, and Resolution II. of the Congress of 1887 (a tentative scheme for which expansion and reform was suggested in Resolution IV. of the Congress of 1886); and further urges that a Legislative Council (of the same character as those which have been suggested for Provinces where Legislative Councils already exist) be established for the Punjab.

2. That this Congress, while appreciating the concessions proposed in the Report of the Public Service Commission, yet feels it necessary to put distinctly on record its opinion that

full justice will never be done to the people of this country until the open competitive examination for the Civil Service of India is held simultaneously in England and in India.

3. That this Congress, having read and considered Resolution XI. of the Congress of 1886, to wit.—

That this Congress do place on record an expression of the universal conviction that a complete separation of the executive and judicial functions (such that in no case the two functions shall be combined in the same officer) has become an urgent necessity; and that, in its opinion, it behoves the Government to effect this separation without further delay; even though this should, in some provinces, involve some extra expenditure—

and Resolution III. of the Congress of 1887, to the same effect, does now, hereby, affirm the same respectively.

4. That this Congress having read and considered Resolution VIII. of the Congress of 1886, to wit.—

That in the opinion of this Congress, the time has now arrived when the system of trial by jury may be safely extended into many parts of the country where it is not at present in force—

Resolution IX. of the Congress of 1886, to wit—

That, in the opinion of this Congress, the innovation made in 1872 in the system of trial by jury depriving the verdicts of juries of all finality, has proved injurious to the country, and the powers then for the first time vested in Sessions Judges and High Courts of setting aside verdicts of acquittal should be at once withdrawn—

and Resolution X. of the Congress of 1886, to wit—

That in the opinion of this Congress, a provision similar to that contained in the Summary Jurisdiction Act of England (under which accused persons in serious cases have the option of demanding a committal to the Sessions Court) should be introduced into the Indian Code of Criminal Procedure, enabling accused persons, in warrant cases, to demand that, instead of being tried by the Magistrate, they be committed to the Court of Sessions—

does now, hereby, affirm the same respectively.

5. That, as it is the general belief of the people of this country that the existing system of police administration in India is highly unsatisfactory in itself and oppressive to them, the Government be respectfully urged to appoint a commission, consisting of official and non-official members, to investigate the entire question as speedily as possible.

6. That this Congress having read and considered Resolution IV. of the Congress of 1887, to wit—

That in view of the loyalty of Her Majesty's Indian Subjects, the Congress considers it desirable that the Queen's Proclamation should be given effect to; that the Military services in the higher grades should be practically opened to the natives of this country; and that the Government should establish Military Colleges in the country whereat the natives of India, as defined by Statute, may be educated and trained for a Military career as officers of the Indian Army,

Resolution XII. of the Congress of 1886, and Resolution V. of the Congress of 1887, to wit—

That in view of the unsettled state of public affairs in Europe, and the immense assistance that the people of this country, if duly prepared therefor, are capable of rendering to Great Britain in the event of any serious complications arising, the Congress once again earnestly appeals to the Government to authorize, under such rules and restrictions as to it may seem fitting, a system of Volunteering for the Indian inhabitants of the country, such as may qualify them to support the Government effectually in any crisis;

and Resolution VIII. of the Congress of 1887, to wit—

That in view of the loyalty of the people, the hardships which the present Arms Act (XI of 1878) causes, and the unmerited slur which it casts upon the people of this country, the

2

Government be moved so to modify the provisions of Chapter IV., and, if necessary, other portions of the said Act, as shall enable all persons to possess and bear Arms unless debarred therefrom, either as individuals, or as members of particular communities or classes, by the orders of the Government of India, (or any local authority empowered by the Government of India on that behalf), for reasons to be recorded in writing and duly published;

does now, hereby, affirm the same respectively.

7. That, having regard to the fact that a serious increase in the consumption of intoxicants has taken place under the systems of Abkari and Excise now prevailing in India, the Government be respectfully urged to adopt some such improved system as shall tend to discourage insobriety.

8. That, as the administration of the Income-Tax, specially as regards incomes below Rs. 1,000, has proved extremely unsatisfactory, it is essential, in the opinion of the Congress, that the taxable minimum be raised to Rs. 1,000.

9. That, this Congress being of opinion that it is the first duty of the British Government in India to foster and encourage education, as well general as technical, in all its branches, and that the declaration made in the recent resolution of the Government of India on the subject of education is calculated to encourage the tendency to reduce imperial expenditure on education, and to withdraw from the control of it, respectfully urges upon Government the extreme importance of increasing, or at any rate of not decreasing, the present expenditure on education, and of the Government continuing to control the Educational Institutions of all kinds now existing.

10. That, having regard to the poverty of the people, the importance of encouraging indigenous manufactures, and the difficulty of practically introducing any general system of technical education with the present imperfect information, Government be moved to delay no longer the appointment of a mixed commission, to inquire into the present industrial condition of the country.

11. That the foregoing Resolutions be submitted for the favourable consideration of His Excellency the Viceroy, and for transmission by him to Her Majesty's Government, with the humble request of this Congress that the reforms suggested in the said Resolutions (based as most of these are on Her Gracious Majesty's Proclamation of 1858) may now be effected and that should it be deemed necessary first to institute any enquiry into any of the matters forming the subjects of these resolutions, such enquiry may be made, as speedily as possible, by a Parliamentary Committee.

12. That this Congress, having watched with interest and sympathy the exertions that are being made in England for the total abrogation of laws and rules relating to the regulation of prostitution by the State in India, places on record its appreciation of the services thus rendered to this country, and its desire to co-operate by all means in its power in the attainment of this laudable object.

13. That no subject shall be passed for discussion by the Subject Committee or allowed to be discussed at any Congress by the President thereof, to the introduction of which the Hindu or Mahomedan Delegates as a body object, unanimously or nearly unanimously; and that if, after the discussion of any subject which has been admitted for discussion, it shall appear that all the Hindu or all the Mahomedan Delegates, as a body, are unanimously, or nearly unanimously, opposed to the Resolution which it is proposed to pass thereon, such Resolution shall be dropped; provided that this rule shall refer only to subjects in regard to which the Congress has not already definitely pronounced an opinion.

14. That the question of the introduction of a Permanent Settlement of the Land Revenue Demand into the Madras and Bombay Presidencies and other provinces be referred to the several Standing Congress Committees, with instructions to report upon the same, in so

far as it affects their respective circles, to the Congress of 1889.

15. That this Congress puts on record its disapproval of the recent enhancement of the Salt Tax, as involving a perceptible increase to the burthens of the poorer classes, as also the partial absorption, in a time of peace and plenty, of the only Financial Reserve of the Empire.

16. That the Fifth Indian National Congress do assemble in the Bombay Presidency (either at Bombay itself or at Poona, as may be settled hereafter) on the 26th of December 1889.

17. That Mr. A. O. Hume be re-appointed General Secretary for the ensuing year.

Fifth Congress—Poona—1889.

---

1. That an address be presented to Mr. Charles Bradlaugh, M. P., on behalf of this Congress here assembled, and that Messrs. Adam, Pherozshah Mehta, and W. C. Bonnerjee, are appointed a Committee to settle the wording of the said address.

2. That the following skeleton scheme for the reform and reconstitution of the Council of the Governor-General for making Laws and Regulations, and the Provincial Legislative Councils, is adopted, and that the President of this Congress do submit the same to Charles Bradlaugh, Esq., M. P., with the respectful request of this Congress that he may be pleased to cause a Bill to be drafted on the lines indicated in this skeleton scheme and introduce the same in the British House of Commons :—

SCHEME.

(1) The Imperial and Provincial Legislative Councils to consist respectively of members, not less than one-half of whom are to be elected, not more than one-fourth to sit ex-officio, and the rest to be nominated by Government.

(2) Revenue districts to constitute ordinarily territorial units, for electoral purposes.

(3) All male British subjects above 21 years of age possessing certain qualifications and not subject to certain disqualifications (both of which will be settled later) to be voters.

(4) Voters in each district to elect representatives to one or more electoral bodies, according to local circumstances at the rate of 12 per million of the total population of the district, such representatives to possess qualifications and not to be subject to certain disqualifications, both of which will be settled later.

(5) All the representatives thus elected by all the districts included in the jurisdiction of each electoral body, to elect members to the Imperial Legislature at the rate of 1 per every five million of the total populations of the electoral jurisdiction, and to their own Provincial Legislature at the rate of 1 per million of the said total population, in such wise that whenever the Parsees, Christians, Mahomedans or Hindus are in a minority, the total number of Parsees, Christians, Mahomedans or Hindus, as the case may be, elected to the Provincial Legislature, shall not, so far as may be possible, bear a less proportion to the total number of members elected thereto, than the total number of Parsees, Christians, Hindus or Mahomedans, as the case may be, in such electoral jurisdiction, bears to its total population. Members of both Legislatures to possess certain qualifications and not to be subject to certain disqualifications, both of which will be settled later.

(6) All elections to be by ballot.

3. That this present Congress does hereby ratify and confirm the resolutions passed by previous Congresses as to—

(*a*) the urgent necessity for the complete separation of executive and judicial functions, such that, in no case, shall the two functions be combined in the same officer;

(*b*) the expediency of extending into many parts of the country, where it is not at present in force, the system of trial by jury;

(*c*) the necessity of withdrawing from the High Courts, the powers, first vested in them in 1872, of setting aside verdicts of acquittal by juries ;

(*d*) the necessity of introducing, into the Code of Criminal Procedure, a provision enabling accused persons, in warrant cases, to demand that, instead of being tried by the Magistrate, they be committed to the Court of Sessions ;

(*e*) the highly unsatisfactory character of the existing system of Police Administration in India, and the absolute necessity of a fundamental reform therein ;

(*f*) the expediency of both, establishing Military Colleges in India, whereat the Natives of India, as defined by Statute, may be educated and trained for a military career as officers of the Indian Army, and of authorising, under such rules and restrictions as may seem necessary, such a system of volunteering for the Indian inhabitants of the country as may qualify them to support the Government in any crisis :

(*g*) the extremely unsatisfactory character of the Income Tax Administration, especially as regards incomes below rupees one thousand, and the expediency of raising the taxable minimum to this amount :

(*h*) the extreme importance of increasing, instead of diminishing, as the present tendency appears to be, the public expenditure on education in all its branches, and the necessity, in view to the promotion of one of the most essential of these branches, the technical, of the appointment of a mixed commission to enquire into the present industrial condition of the country ;

(*i*) the impolicy and injustice involved in the late increase of the Salt Tax in a time of profound peace, and the urgent necessity for an immediate reduction of this tax, and the re-imposition, to balance the deficit thus caused of light *ad valorem* import duties ;

(*j*) the necessity for the reduction of, instead of the continual increase to, the military expenditure of the country.

4. That this Congress hereby tenders its sincere thanks to Messrs. Caine and Smith, and the members who voted with them, in connection with the debate on the Indian Excise Question in the House of Commons; and while fully appreciating what has been done by some of the local Governments towards the improvement of their systems of Excise and Abkari, desires to express the earnest hope that no further time may be lost in giving full effect to the Resolution of the House of Commons.

5. That this Congress, while thanking Her Majesty's Government for raising the age for the Indian Civil Service Competitive Examination from 19 to 23, does hereby put on record an emphatic expression of the universal disappointment which has been created by the rest of that Government's orders in regard to the Public Service Question, (the net result of which orders is to place the people of India in a worse position than they previously held), and reiterates the national conviction that no real justice will be done to India, in this matter, until the simultaneous holding in India, and England, of all examinations, for all Civil branches of the Public Service in India, at present held only in England, be conceded.

6. That, in view of the loyalty of the people, the hardships, that the Arms Act (XI of 1878), as at present administered, entails, and the unmerited slur which it casts upon them, the Government be moved so to modify the rules made under this Act that all restrictions as to the possession and bearing of arms shall apply equally to all persons residing in or visiting India ; that licenses to possess and bear arms shall be liberally and generally distributed wherever wild animals habitually destroy human life, cattle or crops ; and that these and all licenses issued under the rules, shall be granted once for all, shall operate throughout the Provincial jurisdiction within which they are issued, be only revocable on proof of misuse, and shall not require yearly or half-yearly renewals.

7. That the Government be urged to take the subject of Permanent settlement once

more under consideration in view to practical action thereon, such that fixity and permanency may be given to the Government Land Revenue demand without further delay, at any rate, in all fully populated and well cultivated tracts of country.

8. That, in view of the fall that has already occurred in the price of silver and in the exchange value of the Indian Rupee, it is impolitic on the part of the British Government to maintain any hindrances whatever to the consumption of silver for manufacturing purposes; and that this Congress strongly urges upon Her Majesty's Government that, not only as an act of justice to India (a matter which has been repeatedly brought to the notice of Her Majesty's Ministers), but also as an act of expediency in the interests of Her Majesty's British as well as Indian subjects, the plate duties should be immediately abolished, and Hall-marking be made a voluntary institution.

9. That this Congress respectfully expresses the earnest hope that, in the interest of the people of India, the House of Commons will forthwith restore the right, formerly possessed by members of that Honourable House, of stating to Parliament any matter of grievance of the natives of India, before Mr. Speaker leaves the Chair, for the presentation in Committee of the Indian Budget statement, and earnestly trusts that the House of Commons will, in future, take into consideration the Annual Indian Budget statement at such a date as will ensure its full and adequate discussion; and further authorizes the President, Sir William Wedderburn. Bart., to sign a petition in the name and on behalf of this Congress for presentation to the House of Commons in accordance with the terms of this Resolution.

10. That, in view to his approaching departure, this Congress puts on record an expression of the high sense entertained, not only in the Bomby Presidency, but, throughout India, of the ability, integrity and impartiality that have characterised Lord Reay's administration, as also of the gratitude which the whole country feels to be his due for the sympathy that he has ever extended to Indian aspirations and efforts.

11. That the Subjects Committee be instructed to settle the question, (left open in the skeleton scheme for the reconstruction of the councils, embodied in Resolution II.) of the qualifications requisite for, and the disqualifications which should debar from, becoming—

(*a*) a Voter; (*b*) a Representative; (*c*) a Member of a Provincial Legislative Council; and (*d*) a Member of the Imperial Legislative Council;

and to submit their Report thereon to Charles Bradlaugh, Esq., M. P., for the purpose of the Bill which he has been requested to draw.

12. That Mr. A. O. Hume, C.B., be re-elected General Secretary of the National Congress for the ensuing years.

(*a*) That in view of the larger number of delegates this year assembled and the probability arising from past experience, of their number continuing to increase year by year, henceforth the number of delegates to be allowed from each Congress circle be limited to five per million of the total population of the circle: the Standing Committee of each circle allotting the number which their jurisdiction, as a whole, is entitled to elect, amongst their several electoral divisions, as may seem most expedient.

(*b*) That from the date of Mr. Hume's departure for England, the Hon'ble Pundit Ajoodhinath be appointed Joint General Secretary, and that Rs. 5,000 be assigned for the payment by him of such Assistant Secretaries as he may find it necessary to employ, clerical assistance, postage, telegraphs and printing; and further that Mr. W. C. Bonnerjee be appointed Standing Counsel for Bengal, Mr. Pherozshah Mehta, Standing Counsel for Bombay and Mr. Ananda Charlu, Standing Counsel for Madras, to the Joint General Secretary.

(*c*) That the tentative rules for the constitution and working of the Congress which were first considered at Madras, and in regard to which various addenda have from time to time been circulated, be thoroughly considered during the coming year by the several Standing

Congress Committees, and definitely dealt with by the Congress at its next session.

(*d*) That the Congress does hereby confirm the appointment of Sir. W. Wedderburn, Bart., and Messrs. W. S. Caine, M. P., W. S. Bright Maclaren, M. P., J. E. Ellis, M. P, Dadabhai Naoroji and George Yule, as a Committee (with power to add to their number) to guide and direct the operations and control the expenditure of the National Congress Agency in England, and does further tender its sincere thanks to these gentlemen, and to Mr. W. Digby, C. I. E., the Secretary, for the service which they are rendering to India.

(*e*) That this Congress does formally appoint Mr. George Yule, Mr, A. O. Hume, Mr. Adam, Mr. Eardley Norton, Mr. J. E. Howard, Mr. Pherozshah Mehta, Mr. Surendranath Bannerjee, Mr. Mono Mohan Ghose, Mr. Shurfuddin, Mr. R. N. Mudholker, and Mr. W. C. Bonnerjee to represent its views in England and press upon the consideration of the British Public the political reforms which the Congress has advocated,

(*f*) That a sum of Rs. 45,000 be raised for the expenses of the Congress work in this country and in England during the ensuing year, and that the different Standing Committees do send their respective apportioned amounts to the General Secretary, the one half in three, and the balance in six months.

14. That the Sixth Indian National Congress do assemble at some City in Bengal, the exact place to be fixed hereafter, on the 26th of December, 1890.

15. That the Fifth Indian National Congress hereby tenders its heart-felt thanks to its President, Sir William Wedderburn, as well for his ready sacrifice of personal and political considerations involved by his journey from England to India, as for that courtesy, impartiality and never-failing sympathy which, characteristics of his long and honourable career as an official of this country, have marked his control of the proceedings of this assembly.

———(o)———

Sixth Congress—Calcutta—1890.

1 That this Congress, having considered the draft Bill recently introduced into Parliament by Mr. Charles Bradlaugh, entitled "an Act to amend the Indian Councils Act of 1861" approves the same as calculated to secure a substantial instalment of that reform, in the Administration of India, for which it has been agitating, and humbly prays the Houses of Parliament of the United Kingdom of Great Britain and Ireland to pass the same into law; and further that its President, Mr. Pherozshah Mehta, is hereby empowered to draw up and sign, on behalf of this assembly, a petition to the House of Commons to the foregoing effect, and to transmit the same to Mr. Charles Bradlaugh for presentation, thereto, in due course.

2. That this present Congress does hereby ratify and confirm the resolutions passed by previous Congresses as to—

(*a*) the urgent necessity for the complete separation of executive and judicial functions, such that, in no case, shall the two functions be combined in the same officer;

(*b*) the expediency of extending into many parts of the country, where it is not at present in force, the system of trial by jury;

(*c*) the necessity of withdrawing from the High Courts the powers, first vested in them in 1872, of setting aside verdicts of acquittal by juries.

(*d*) the necessity of introducing, into the Code of Criminal Procedure, a provision enabling accused persons, in warrant cases, to demand that instead of being tried by the Magistrate they be committed to the Court of Sessions;

(*e*) the highly unsatisfactory character of the existing system of Police Administration in India, and the absolute necessity of a fundamental reform therein;

(*f*) the expediency of both, establishing Military Colleges in India, whereat the Natives of India, as defined by Statute, may be educated and trained for a military career as officers

of the Indian Army, and of authorising, under such rules and restrictions as may seem necessary, such a system of volunteering, for the Indian inhabitants of the country, as may qualify them to support the Government in any crisis;

(*g*) the extremely unsatisfactory character of the Income Tax Administration, especially as regards incomes below rupees one thousand, and the expediency of raising the taxable minimum to this amount;

(*h*) the extreme importance of increasing, instead of diminishing, as the present tendency appears to be, the public expenditure on education in all its branches, and the necessity, in view to the promotion of one of the most essential of these branches, the technical, of the appointment of a mixed commission to enquire into the present industrial condition of the country;

(*i*) the necessity for the reduction of, instead of the continual increase to, the military expenditure of the country;

(*j*) the necessity, if any real justice is to be done to the people of India, of holding, simultaneously in India and England, examinations, at present held only in England, for the Civil branches of the Public Service in India;

(*k*) the expediency of so modifying the rules made under Act XI of 1878 (the Arms Act) that all restrictions as to the possession and bearing of arms shall apply equally to all persons residing in or visiting India; that licenses to possess and bear arms shall be liberally and generally distributed wherever wild animals habitually destroy human life, cattle or crops; and that these and all licenses issued under the rules shall be granted once for all, shall operate throughout the Provincial jurisdiction within which they are issued, be only revocable on proof of misuse, and shall not require yearly or half-yearly renewals.

3. That this Congress respectfully expresses the earnest hope that in the interest of the people of India, the House of Commons will forthwith restore the right formerly possessed by members of that Honourable House, of stating to Parliament any matter of grievance of the natives of India before Mr. Speaker leaves the chair, for the presentation in Committee of the Indian Budget statement, and earnestly trusts that the House of Commons will, in future, take into consideration the Annual Indian Budget statement at such a date as will ensure its full and adequate discussion, and further authorizes its President to sign a Petition, in the name and on behalf of this Congress, for presentation to the House of Commons, in accordance with the terms of this Resolution.

4. That, while recognizing the action taken, in response to its previous prayers, in the matter of Excise Reform by H. M.'s Secretary of State for India and the Supreme Government here, and noting with pleasure the increase to the import duty on Spirits, the taxation imposed on Indian-brewed malt liquors, the decision of the Bengal Government to abolish the outstill system, and the closing of over 7,000 liquor shops by the Madras Government in 1889-90, this Congress regrets that it is still necessary to urge the Government of India to insist on *all* Provincial Administrations carrying out in their integrity the policy in matters of Excise enunciatel in Paras, 103, 104 and 105 of the despatch published in the *Gazette of India* of 1st March 1890, especially as to sub-section 4 of para. 103, *viz.*—

"That efforts should be made to ascertain the existence of local public sentiment, and that a reasonable amount of deference should be paid to such opinion when ascertained."

5. That the condition of the Finances of India having materially improved, and those special circumstances on which the Government relied to justify the recent enhancement of the Salt Tax having practically ceased to exist, this Congress considers it essential that the enhancement referred to should be remitted at an early date, and empowers its President to submit a special memorial on the subject in its name and on its behalf to H. E. the Viceroy in Council.

6. That having reference to the expectations created throughout the country by the Despatch of Her Majesty's Secretary of State in 1862, the principles of which were re-affirmed in a subsequent Despatch of 1865, promising the extension of a Permanent Settlement to all temporarily settled tracts in which certain conditions were fulfilled, and to the fact that throughout large portions of the country those conditions have long since been fulfilled, this Congress respectfully submits that the Government of India is now in honour bound to take up this question of Permanent Settlement, without further delay, in view to practical action thereon, such that fixity and permanency may be given to the Government Land Revenue demand as explicitly promised, by Her Majesty's Secretary of State, more than a quarter of a century ago.

7. That this Congress, having observed with surprise a notice, apparently official, in various Calcutta newspapers which runs as follows:—

THE CONGRESS.

The Bengal Government having learnt that tickets of admission to the visitors' enclosure in the Congress pavilion have been sent to various Government officers residing in Calcutta, has issued a circular to all secretaries, and heads of departments subordinate to it, pointing out that under the orders of the Government of India the presence of Government officials, even as visitors at such meetings, is not advisable, and that their taking part in the proceedings of any such meetings is absolutely prohibited :

and having also considered a letter addressed by the Private Secretary of His Honor the Lieutenant-Governor of Bengal to the Secretary of the Reception Committee, of which the following is an exact copy :—

Belvedere, 26th December, 1890.

DEAR SIR,—In returning herewith the seven cards of admission to the visitors' enclosure of the Congress pavilion, which were kindly sent by you to my address yesterday afternoon, I am desired to say that the Lieutenant-Governor and the members of his household could not possibly avail themselves of these tickets, since the orders of the Government of India definitely prohibit the presence of Government officials at such meetings. Yours faithfully, P. C. Lyon, Private Secretary. To J. Ghosal Esq., Secretary, Congress Reception Committee.

authorizes and instructs its President to draw the attention of His Excellency the Viceroy to the declaration embodied in these papers that Government servants are prohibited from attending any meetings of this Congress even as spectators, and to enquire, most respectfully, whether His Honor the Lieutenant-Governor of Bengal has, or has not, correctly interpreted the orders of the Government of India.

8. That the best thanks of this Congress be tendered to Mr. Charles Bradlaugh, M. P., for the invaluable services rendered by him during the past year, as also to Sir W. Wedderburn, Mr. W. S. Caine, Mr. J. Bright Maclaren, M. P., Mr. J. Ellis, M. P., Mr. George Yule, and Mr. Dadabhai Naoroji for the unselfish zeal and ability with which they have presided over the British Agency of the Congress; further that they put on record an expression of their high appreciation of the manner in which Mr. Digby, C. I. E., Secretary of the Agency, and Messrs. Surendra Nath Banerjee, R. N. Mudholkar, W. C. Bonnerjee, Eardley Norton, and A. O. Hume, delegates to England, respectively, discharged the onerous duties imposed upon them, and of their gratitude to all those members of the British public who so kindly welcomed and so sympathetically gave audience, in over fifty public and a far larger number of private meetings, to one or more of these delegates.

9. That a vote of thanks be recorded to Kumar Debendra Mullick and brothers,

proprietors of the Tivoli Gardens, Mr. N. C. Bose and Babu Bhupendra Nath Bose, proprietors of Mohan Bagan Villa, and to the Hon'ble Sir Romesh Chandra Mitra, Mr. T. N. Palit, Babus Janokee Nath Roy, Gopee Mohan Roy, Harendra Nath Roy, Kissory Mohan Roy, Ramanath Ghose, and Jamadar Ghasiram, owners of houses kindly lent for the use of delegates.

10. That the Seventh Indian National *Congress* do assemble on the 26th December, 1891, at either Madras or Nagpore, as may be hereafter settled, in consultation between the Madras, Central Provinces and Berar Committees, and the Joint General Secretary.

11. That provisional arrangements be made to hold a *Congress.* of not less than 100 delegates, in England, all things being convenient, in 1892, and that the several *Standing Congress Committees* be directed to report, at the coming *Congress*, the names of the delegates that it is proposed to depute from their respective circles.

12. That of the Funds now in the Joint General Secretary's hands and about to be received, a further sum of twenty thousand rupees be added to the Permanent Fund and placed in fixed deposits, and that the rest of the funds accruing on account of this current year, 1890, be held by him available for the immediate purposes of the British Committee of the *Indian National Congress*, but to be replaced as the subscriptions for 1891 are received, and ultimately, also added to the Permanent Fund.

13. That a sum of Rs. 40,000, exclusive of individual donations, is assigned for the expenses of the British Committee of the *Congress* and Rs. 6,000 for the General Secretary's Office and Establishment, and that the several circles and districts do contribute as arranged in Committee.

14. That Mr. A. O. Hume and Pandit Ajoodhia Nath are re-elected General and Joint General Secretaries for the ensuing year.

15. That this *Congress* does formally appoint Messrs. G. Yule, Pherozshah Mehta, W. C. Bonnerjee, J. Adam, Mono Mohan Ghose, A. O. Hume, Kali Charan Bannerjee, Dadabhai Naorojee, D. A. Khare, and such other gentlemen as may volunteer for the duty with the sanction and approval of the *Standing Congress Committees* of their respective circles, to represent its views in England, and press upon the consideration of the British public the political reforms which the *Congress* has advocated.

Seventh Congress—Nagpore—1891.

1. That a Committee be appointed to consider and report, on or before the morning of the 30th instant, whether, or not, it is advisable to discontinue the Annual Sessions of the *Indian National Congress* until after the British Session, and, if not, under what regulations, as to numbers of delegates, localities for assemblage, and the like, future *Congresses* shall be held. The Committee to be composed as follows:—

Ex-Officio Members:—The President. The Chairman of the Reception Committee. The General Secretary. The Joint General Secretary. The Standing Counsels to the *Congresses* And Messrs. Surendranath Bannerjee, Viraraghava Chariar, Hafiz Abdul Rahim, Gangapersad Varma, Pringle Kennedy, Guruprasad Sen, D. E. Watcha, M. B. Namjoshi, Hamid Ali Khan, Vishnu Moreshwar Bhide, Murlidhar, Mudholkar, Deo Rao Vinayak, Gopal Rao Bhide, Bipin Krishna Bose, Dajee Abajee Khare, Madan Mohan Malaviya, Saligram Singh, Sankara Nair.

2. That this *Congress* re-affirms the conclusion arrived at by all previous *Congresses*, *viz.*, that India can never be well or justly governed, nor her people prosperous or contented, until they are allowed, through their elected representatives, a potential voice in the Legislaures of their own country, and respectfully urges the people of Great Britain and Ireland whose good will towards India it gratefully recognizes, to permit no further delay in the concession of this just and necessary reform.

3. That this *Congress*, concurring in the views set forth in previous *Congresses* affirms—

That fully fifty millions of the population, a number yearly increasing, are dragging out a miserable existence on the verge of starvation, and that, in every decade, several millions actually perish by starvation.

That this unhappy condition of affairs is largely due to—

(*a*) *the exclusion of the people of India from a due participation in the administration, and all control over the finances, of their own country, the remedy for which has been set forth in Resolution II ;*

(*b*) *the extravagant cost of the present administration, Military and Civil, but especially the former ; and to*

(*c*) *a short-sighted system of Land Revenue Administration, whereby not only is all improvement in the agriculture of the country, on which nine-tenths of the population depend for subsistence, rendered impossible, but the gradual deterioration of that agriculture assured.*

That hence it has became imperatively necessary—

That the cost of the administration be greatly reduced ; in the military branch, by a substantial reduction of the standing army, by the substitution of long term local European troops like those of the Hon. E. I. Company for the present short term Imperial regiments with their heavy cost of recruitment in England, in transport and of the excessive mortality amongst non-acclimatized youths ; by the cessation of the gigantic waste of money that has gone on now for several years, on so-called Frontier Defences, and by a strict economy in the Commissariat, Ordinance and Store Departments ; and in the Civil branch, by the wide substitution of a cheaper indigenous agency for the extremely costly imported Staff ; and that measures be at once taken to give, as was promised by the British Government thirty years ago, fixity and permanence to the land Revenue demand and thus permit capital and labour to combine to develop the agriculture of tthe country, which, under the existing system of temporary settlements, in recent times often lasting for short periods, in some cases only extending to 10 and 12 years, is found to be impossible ; and to establish agricultural banks.

That this *Congress* does most earnestly entreat the people of Great Britain and Ireland not to permit any further sacrifice of life by the shortcomings of the existing, doubtless well-intentioned, but none the less unsatisfactory, administration, but to insist, and speedily, on these reforms.

4. That this *Congress*, concurring with previous *Congresses*, is of opinion that, to ensure the adequate protection and efficient defence of the country, it is desirable that the Government should conciliate Indian Public opinion and encourage and qualify the Indians to defend their homes and their Government—

(*a*) by so modifying the rules under the Arms Act, as to make them equally applicable to all residents in, or visitors to, India, without distinction of creed, class or colour ; to ensure the liberal concession of licenses whereever wild animals habitually destroy human life, cattle or crops, and to make all licenses granted under the revised rules, of life-long tenure, revocable only on proof of misuse and valid throughout the Provincial Jurisdiction in which they are issued;

(*b*) by establishing Military Colleges in India, whereas natives of India, as defined by Statute, may be educated and trained for a military career, as *commissioned or non-commissioned* officers (according to capacity and qualifications) of the Indian army ;

(*c*) by organising, throughout the more warlike races of the Empire, a system of militia service ; and

(*d*) by authorizing and stimulating a wide-spread system of volunteering, such as

obtains in Great Britain, amongst the people of India.

5. That as one step towards ensuring the wider employment of Indians in the administration of the country, and as a matter of simple justice to the people of India, this *Congress*, agreeing with previous *Congresses*, declares it to be essential that all examinations for any and all of the Civil Branches of the Public Service in India, which at present are held only in England, should henceforth be also held simultaneously in India.

6. That this *Congress* concurs with its predecessors in strongly advocating—

(*a*) the reduction of the salt tax, by at least the amount of its latest enhancement; (*b*) the raising of the income tax taxable minimum from Rs. 500 to Rs. 1,000, (*c*) persistent pressure by the Government of India on all Provincial Administrations to induce them to carry out, in its integrity, excise policy enunciated in paras 103, 104 and 105 of the despatch, published in the *Gazette of India*, of March 1st, 1890, and the introduction of a simple system of local option in the case of all villages.

7. That having regard to the unsatisfactory character, in many respects, of the Judicial and Police Administration, this *Congress* concurs with its predecessors in strongly advocating—

(*a*) the complete separation of Executive and Judicial functions such that in no case shall the two functions be combined in the same officer;

(*b*) the extension into many parts of the country, where it is not at present in force, of the system of trial by jury;

(*c*) the withdrawal from High Courts of the powers, first vested in them in 1872, of setting aside verdicts of acquittals by juries;

(*d*) the introduction, into the Code of Criminal Procedure, of a provision enabling accused persons, in warrant cases to demand that instead of being tried by the Magistrate they be committed to the Court of Sessions;

(*e*) the fundamental reform of the Police Administration, by a reduction in the numbers and an increase in the salaries, and in the qualifications of the lower grades, and their far more careful enlistment, and by the selection for the higher posts of gentlemen of higher capacities, more in touch with the respectable portions of the community, and less addicted to military pretensions, than the majority of the existing Deputy Inspectors-General, Superintendents and Assistant Superintendents of Police.

8. That this *Congress*, concurring with previous *Congresses*, affirms the importance of increasing (instead of diminishing, as appears to be the present policy of the Government) the public expenditure on all branches of education, and the importance of increasing (instead of diminishing, as appears to be the present policy of the Government,) in view to the promotion of one of the most essential of these branches, the technical, of appointing a mixed Commission to enquire into the present industrial condition of the country.

9. *Read the following telegram from General Booth* :—

"May I be allowed to commend, to the attention of the Congress, the claims of the millions of India's starving poor and to urge the consideration of some scheme by which these destitute multitudes can be placed upon the waste lands of the country, in such an organised and befriended manner, as will enable them to gain, for themselves, those necessaries of a healthy existence which, in their present circumstances, are denied; praying for the blessing of God upon the labours of the Congress, yours in sympathy with every effort, for the amelioration of the miseries of mankind."

That the following telegram be despatched in reply to General Booth :—

"The Congress having received and considered your kindly message thank you cordially for the same. No possible scheme of internal immigration can perceptibly relieve the fifty to sixty millions of half-starving paupers, whose sad condition constitutes the primary raison d'etre of the Congress. It is only by modifying the adverse conditions out of which this wiedspread misery arises, and by raising the moral standard of the people that any real relief is possible. As regards the first, the Congress programme now embodies all primarily

essential reforms; as regards the second, in every province and in every caste, associations, public or private are working with a yearly increasing earnestness. Many good missionaries are labouring in the same field, and we have to thank you that your army too is now engaged in the good work of elevating our masses. May your efforts and ours, in both directions, be crowned with success. Congress, including men of many creeds, welcomes cordially all who seek to benefit our suffering brethren."

Read the Report of the Committee appointed, under Resolution (1), which runs as follows:—

10. "*Your Committee have considered the matter referred to them and have also consulted informally, various members of the Subjects Committee and other delegates. They are clearly of opinion that it is not advisable to discontinue the Annual Session, of the Indian National Congress until after the British Session, and that future Congresses should be held under the same regulations as heretofore.*"

That the Annual Sessions of the *Congress* in India continue to be held until all necessary reforms have been secured.

11. That having regard to the very serious discontent created, especially in Peninsular India, by the practical administration of the Forest Laws, the Government of India be most respectfully, but earnestly, entreated to investigate this carefully, and endeavour to mitigate its harshness and render it less obnoxious to the poorer classes.

12. That this *Congress* hereby tenders its most grateful acknowledgments to Sir W. Wedderburn, and the members of the British *Congress* Committee, for the services rendered by them to India during the past year, and respectfully urges them to widen henceforth the sphere of their usefulness, by interesting themselves, not only in those questions dealt with by the *Congress* here, but in all Indian matters submitted to them, and properly vouched for, in which any principle accepted by the *Congress* is involved.

13. That this *Congress* puts on record an expression of the gratitude felt, throughout India, for the signal services rendered by the late Mr. Charles Bradlaugh to that country's cause, and of the deep and universal sorrow which his untimely death has engendered; and that a copy of this Resolution signed by the President, be transmitted through the British Committee for presentation to Mrs. Bradlaugh Bonner.

14. That this *Congress*, hereby, puts formally on record its high estimate and deep appreciation of the great services which Mr. Dadabhai Naoroji has rendered, during more than a quarter of a century, to the cause of India: that it expresses its unshaken confidence in him and its earnest hope that he may prove successful, at the coming elections, in his candidature for Central Finsbury, and, at the same time, tenders, on behalf of the vast population it represents, India's most cordial acknowledgments to all in England, whether in Central Finsbury or elsewhere, who have aided, or may aid him, to win a seat in the House of Commons.

15. That in view of the General Election now impending in England, and in accordance with the recommendation of British Committee, the provisional arrangements, set on foot in pursuances of the Resolution passed at the Calcutta *Congress* of 1890, for holding, all things being convenient, a *Congress* o fnot less than 100 Delegates in England in 1892, be now suspended until after such General Election.

16. That a sum of Rs. 40,000, exclusive of individual donations, is assigned for the expenses of the British Committee of the *Congress*, and Rs. 6,000 for the General Secretary's office and establishment, and that the several circles do contribute as arranged in Committee for the year 1892.

17. That Mr. A. O. Hume and Pandit Ajoodhianath are re-elected General and Joint-General Secretaries for the ensuing year.

18. That the Eighth Indian National *Congress* do assemble on the 26th December 1892, at Allahabad.

Eighth Congress—Allahabad—1892.

1. That this *Congress*, while accepting in a loyal spirit the Indian Councils Act recently enacted by the Parliament of Great Britain, as explained by the present Prime Minister, with the assent of the then Under-Secretary of State for India,—that it is intended by it to give the people of India *a real living representation* in the Legislative Councils,—regrets that the Act itself does not, in terms, concede to the people the right of electing their own representatives to the Council, and hopes and expects that the rules, now being prepared under the Act, will be framed on the lines of Mr. Gladstoné's declaration in the House of Commons, and will do adequate justice to the people of this country; further, that it prays that these rules may be published in the official Gazettes, like other proposed legislative measures, before being finally adopted.

2. That this *Congress* hereby places on record its deep regret at the resolution of the Government of India on the report of the Public Service Commission, in that—

(*a*) Whereas, if the recommendations of the Public Service Commission had been carried out in their integrity, the posts proposed to be detached from the schedule of the statute of 1861 would have formed part of an organised Service, specially reserved for the Natives of India, the resolution of Government leaves these posts altogether isolated, to which appointment can be made only under the Statute of 1870;

(*b*) Whereas, while 108 appointments were recommended by the Public Service Commission for the Provincial Service, 93 such appointments only have actually been thrown open to that Service: the number to be allotted to Assam not having yet been announced;

(*c*) Whereas, while Membership of the Board of Revenue and a Commissionership of a Division, were recommended for the Province of Bengal and some other Provinces, the Government has not given effect to this resolution;

(*d*) Whereas, while one-third of the Judgeships were recommended to be thrown open to the Provincial Service, only one-fifth have been so thrown open.

And this *Congress*, again, distinctly puts on record its opinion, that full justice will never be done to the people of this country, until the open Competitive Examination for the Civil Service of India is held simultaneously in England and in India.

That this *Congress* seeing the serious mischief arising to the country from the combination of Judicial and Executive functions in the same official, once again puts on record its deliberate and earnest conviction that a complete separation of these functions has become an urgent necessity, and that, in its opinion, it behoves the Government to effect this separation without further delay, even though this should, in some provinces, involve extra expenditure.

4. That having regard to the diversity of opinion that prevails on the Currency Question, and the importance of the question itself, this Congress desires to express its earnest hope, that unless its hands are forced by the action of any Foreign Power, necessitating a change in the currency, or the standard, which might prove injurious to the interests of the country, the Government of India will refrain from taking any steps, until the labors of the Brussels Conference have been completed: and, further, that the Government will lay before the Public, for discussion, the proposals which Lord Herschell's Committee may recommend before definite action, if any, is resolved upon.

5. That this Congress concurs with its predecessors in strongly advocating—

(*a*) The reduction of the salt duty by at least the amount of its latest enhancement;

(*b*) The raising of the Income-tax taxable minimum from five-hundred to one thousand;

(*c*) Persistent pressure by the Government of India on all Provincial Administrations,

to induce them to carry out, in its integrity, the Excise policy enunciated in paragraphs 103, 104, 105, of the Despatch, published in the Gazette of India of March, 1890, and the introduction of a simple system of Local option in the case of all villages;

(*d*) The introduction into the Code of Criminal Procedure of a provision enabling accused persons, in warrant cases, to demand that instead of being tried by the Magistrate they may be committed to the Court of Sessions;

(*e*) The fundamental reform of the Police administration, by a reduction in the numbers and an increase in the salaries and in the qualifications of the lower grades, and their far more careful enlistment; and by the selection for the higher posts of gentlemen of higher capacities, more in touch with the respectable portions of the community, and less addicted to military pretensions, than the majority of existing of Deputy Inspectors-General, Superintendents, and Assistant Superintendents of Police are;

(*f*) A modification of the rules under the Arms Act, so as to make them equally applicable to all residents in, or visitors to India, without distinction of creed, caste or colour; to ensure the liberal concession of licenses wherever wild animals habitually destroy human life, cattle or crops; and to make all licenses, granted under the revised rules, of life-long tenure, revocable only on proof of misuse, and valid throughout the Provincial jurisdiction in which they are issued;

(*g*) The establishment of Military Colleges in India, whereat natives of India, as defined by statute, may be educated and trained for a military career as Commissioned or Non-commissioned Officers (according to capacity and qualifications) of the Indian army;

(*h*) The organising throughout the more warlike races of the Empire of a system of Militia service; and

(*i*) The authorising and stimulating of a wide-spread system of volunteering, such as obtains in Great Britain, amongst the people of India.

6 That this *Congress* views with the deepest concern and alarm the recent policy of Government with respect to trial by Jury, and particularly the action of the Governments of Bengal and Assam in withdrawing the right of trial by Jury in the majority of serious offences, and most respectfully, but firmly, protests aganist such policy and action as retrograde, reactionary, and injurious to the best interests of the country, and prays that the same may be reversed by the Government of India, and failing that, by the Government in England; and that, as prayed for in resolutions of previous *Congresses*, the right of trial by Jury be extended to those parts of the country where it is not now in force, it being the only safeguard for the people in the present unsatisfactory condition of the administration of criminal justice in British India.

7. That having regard to the fact that the abnormal increase in the annual military expenditure of the Empire since 1885-86 is principally owing to the military activity going on beyond the natural lines of the defences of the country, in pursuance of the Imperial policy of Great Britain in its relation with some of the Great Powers of Europe, this *Congress* is of opinion that, in bare justice to India, an equitable portion of that expenditure should be borne by the British Treasury, and that the revenues of India should be proportionately relieved of that burden.

8. That this *Congress* is emphatically of opinion, that it is highly inexpedient in the present state of education in the country, that Government grants for High Education should in any way be withdrawn, and concurring with previous *Congress*, affirms in the most emphatic manner, the importance of increasing the public expenditure on all branches of Education, and the expediency, in view to the promotion of one of the most essential of these branches, *i.e.*, the technical, of appointing a mixed Commission to enquire into the present industrial condition of the country.

9. That this *Congress* emphatically re-affirms Resolution III of the *Congress* of 1891, and having regard to the fact that fully fifty millions of the population, a number yearly increasing, are dragging out a miserable existence on the verge of starvation, and that in every decade several millions actually perish by starvation, deems it imperatively necessary that the cost of administration, especially in the military branch of the Public Service, should be greatly reduced, and that measures should at once be taken to give, as was promised by the British Government over thirty years ago, fixity and permanence to the land revenue demand, and thus permit capital and labour to combine to develop the agriculture of the country, which, under the existing system of temporary settlements, in recent times often lasting for short periods, in some cases only extending to ten and twelve years—is found to be impossible ; and to establish Agricultural Banks. And this *Congress*, again, most earnestly entreats the people of Great Britain and Ireland, not to permit any further sacrifice of life owing to the shortcomings of the existing, doubtless well-intentioned, but none the less unsatisfactory, administration, but to insist, and, that speedily, on the reforms, then and now, so earnestly advocated.

10. That this *Congress* entirely adopts Resolution XI of the Congress of 1891, and reiterates its prayer, that having regard to the very serious discontent created, particularly in Peninsular India, by the practical administration of the Forest Laws, the Government of India do investigate this matter carefully, and endeavour to mitigate the harshness of such administration, and render it less obnoxious to the poorer classes.

11. That Mr. W. C. Bonnerjee, Mr. P. M. Mehta, Mr. Surendra Nath Banerji, and Rai Bahadur Anunda Charlu, be appointed a Committee to prepare a petition on the lines indicated by the petition printed at foot, and that the President be authorised to sign it, on behalf of this Congress, and send it to Mr. Dadabhai Naoroji, M. P., for presentation to the House of Commons.

To The Hon'ble, The Commons of Great Britain and Ireland, in Parliament assembled,

The humble petition of the President and members of the Eighth Indian National Congress, held at Allahabad, on the 28th, 29th and 30th December, 1892.

Respectfully showeth.

(1) That in conformity with a resolution adopted at the Eighth Indian National Congress, your humble petitioners beg to bring to the attention of your Hon'ble House, the sad disappointment which prevails in all parts of Her Majesty's Indian Empire at the orders passed upon the labours of the Public Service Commission.

(2) That the Commission was instructed by the Government of India to submit a scheme which might reasonably be expected to possess the elements of finality and to do full justice to the claims of the Natives of India to higher and more extensive employment in the Public Service. Neither object has been secured by the labours of the Public Service Commission. The Statutory Service, under which appointments had been made, has been abolished, and nothing has been done to secure to the people the full enjoyment of the boon conferred upon them by the Act of 1870. The Government of India, in their resolution appointing the Commission, observed, "that the Statute of 1870 is one of remarkable breadth and liberality, and it empowers the Government of India and the Secretary of State, acting together, to frame rules under which Natives of India may be admitted to any of the offices hitherto reserved for the Covenanted Civil Service." But the result of the Commission's enquiry has been a reduction in the number of offices open to Indians.

(3) That in respect, likewise, to simultaneous examination in England and in India for appointment in the Civil Service, the Report of the Commission, endorsed by the Government of India, has given no satisfaction whatever. The weight of the evidence taken by the Commissioners was distinctly in favour of simultaneous examination. Among

the witnesses examined, there was a very large preponderance of those who were in favour of simultaneous examinations.

(4) That the disappointment which is everywhere felt at the resolution of the Government of India on the Public Service Commission, is of such a character that this *Congress* has felt constrained to lay the matter before the Hon'ble House, and to pray that it will direct the Government of India to give full effect to the Act of 1870, in the matter of appointing Natives of India to the Public Service of their country.

12. That this *Congress*, in concurrence with the first *Congress* held at Bombay in 1885, considers that the creation of a Legislative Council for the Province of the Punjab is an absolute necessity for the good Government of that Province, and, having regard to the fact that a similar Council has been created for the United Provinces, hopes that no time will be lost in creating such a Council.

13. That this *Congress* hereby tenders its most grateful acknowledgments to Sir W. Wedderburn and the members of the British Congress Committee, for the services rendered by them to India during the past year, and entirely approves and confirms the re-construcion of the British Committee of the *Congress* which has been effected by them, as also, the new arrangements which they have made in regard to their office establishment, and the journal "*India*;" and that this *Congress* also tenders its thanks to Mr. W. Digby, C. I. E. for the services which he rendered to the cause during his tenure of office as Secretary to the British Committee.

14. That this *Congress* is thankful that the House of Commons is vigilant in regard to the recent purity legislation by the Government in India, and desires, once again, to enter its protest against all State-regulated immorality in India.

15. That, regard being had to the present political situation in England, the provisional arrangements set on foot, in pursuance of the resolution passed at the Calcutta Congress, 1890, for holding—all things being convenient—a *Congress* of not less than hundred delegates in England, in 1892, be now suspended, until after the Session of the *Congress* in 1893.

16. That this *Congress* most respectfully and cordially tenders, on behalf of the vast population it represents, India's most heartfelt thanks to the electors of Central Finsbury for electing Mr. Dadabhai Naoroji, their member in the House of Commons; and it again puts on record its high estimate and deep appreciation of the services which that gentleman has rendered to this country, reiterates its unshaken confidence in him, and looks upon him as the Indian representative in the House of Commons.

17. That this *Congress* hereby empowers the Trustees of the Congress Permanent Fund—now locked up in the "New Oriental Bank Corporation, Ld.," at present in liquidation—to send, at least, five hundred pounds out of it to the British Committee, to be recouped by subscriptions from the Standing Congress Commitees.

18. That regard being had to the representations received from the British Commitee, this *Congress* is of opinion, that a sum equivalent in Rupees to two thousand eight hundred pounds sterling, be allotted for the expenses of the British Committee, for the year 1892-93; that deducting the money which has been received up to now, the balance be allotted amongst the different Standing Congress Commitees,in accordance with the arrangements come to with them and that the sum be remitted to England as soon as practicable.

19. That this *Congress* re-appoints Mr. A. O. Hume, C. B., to be its General Secretary and appoints Rai Bahadur P. Ananda Charlu to be its Joint-General Secretary for the ensuing year.

20. That the Ninth Indian National Congress do assemble on such day after Christmas, 1893, as may be determined upon, at Amritsar.

21. That this *Congress* hereby tenders its best thanks to His Highness the Maharaja of

Darbhanga, for having so kindly lent his Castle and grounds for the holding of this *Congress.*

22. That this *Congress* confirms the appointment of Pandit Bishumbhar Nath, in place of the late Pandit Ajudhia Nath, as one of the Trustees of the Congress Permanent Fund.

Ninth Congress—Lahore—1893.

---

1. That this *Congress* while tendering its most sincere thanks to His Excellency the Viceroy for the liberal spirit in which he has endeavoured to give effect to the Indian Councils Act of 1892, regrets to have to put on record the facts, that alike in the Rules of the Government of India and in the practice of most of the Local Governments, notably in that of the Government of Bombay, material alterations are necessary if real effect is to be given to spirit of this act, and, that the Punjab, one of the most important Provinces in the Empire, is still denied the right to be represented, either in the Viceroy's or in any Local Council.

2. That this *Congress*, in concurrence with the first *Congress*, held at Bombay in 1885 and other subsequent *Congresses*, considers that the creation of a Legislative Council for the Province of the Punjab is an absolute necessity for the good Government of that province, and having regard to the fact that a similar council has been created for the United Provinces, hopes that no time will be lost in creating such a Council.

3. That this *Congress* concurs with its predecessors in strongly advocating :—

(*a*) The reduction of the salt duty by at least the amount of its latest enhancement;

(*b*) The raising of the Income-tax taxable minimum from five hundred to one thousand Rupees;

(*c*) Persistent pressure by the Government of India on all Provincial administrations, to induce them to carry out, in its integrity, the Excise policy enunciated in paragraphs 103, 104, 105 of the despatch, published in the Gazette of India of March, 1890, and the introduction of a simple system of local option in the case of all villages.

(*d*) The introduction into the Code of Criminal Procedure of a provision enabling accused persons, in warrant cases, to demand that instead of being tried by the magistrate they may be committed to the Court of Sessions;

(*e*) The fundamental reform of the Police administration, by a reduction in the numbers and an increase in the salaries and in the qualifications of the lower grades, and their far more careful enlistment; and by the selection for the higher posts of gentlemen of higher capacities, more in touch with the respectable portions of the community, and less addicted to military pretensions than the majority of existing Deputy Inspectors-General, Superintendents, and Assistant Superintendents of Police are;

(*f*) A modification of the rules under the Arms Act, so as to make them equally applicable to all residents in, or visitors to India without distinction of creed, caste or colour; to ensure the liberal concession of licenses wherever wild animals habitually destroy human life, cattle or crops; and to make all licenses, granted under the revised rules, of life-long tenure, revocable only on proof of misuse, and valid throughout the Provincial jurisdiction in which they are issued;

(*g*) The establishment of Military Colleges in India, whereat natives of India, as defined by statute, may be educated and trained for a military career as Commissioned or Non-Commissioned Officers (according to capacity and qualification) of the Indian army.

(*h*) The organising throughout the more warlike races of the Empire of a system of Militia service; and,

(*i*) The authorising and stimulating a wide-spread system of volunteering such as obtains in Great Britain, amongst the people of India.

4. That this *Congress* is of opinion that the time has arrived when, in the interest of

public medical education and the advancement of medical science and of scientific work in this country, as also in the cause of economic administration, the Civil medical service of India, should be reconstructed on the basis of such services in other civilised countries, wholly detached from and independent of the Military service, so as to give full effect to the educational policy of Government, which is to encourage education for its own sake in every branch, and to raise a scientific medical profession in India by throwing open fields for medical and scientific work to the best talent available and indigenous talent in particular.

5. That this *Congress* desires to thank the British House of Commons for their just and wise vote in regard to Simultaneous Examinations in England and in India, and most earnestly prays that august body to insist upon their orders being given prompt effect to by the Secretary of State for India and the Government of India.

6. That this *Congress* having now for many successive years vainly appealed to the Government of India to remove one of the gravest stigmas on British rule in India, one fraught with incalculable oppression to all classes of the community throughout the country, now hopeless of any other redress, humbly entreats the Secretary of State for India to order the immediate appointment, in each province, of a Committee (one half at least, of whose members shall be non-official natives of India, qualified by education and experience in the workings of the various courts to deal with the question) to prepare each a scheme for the complete separation of all Judicial and Executive functions in their own province with as little additional cost to the State as may be practicable, and the submission of such schemes, with the comments of the several Indian Governments thereon, to himself, at some early date which he may be pleased to fix.

7. That this *Congress* having considered the report of the Parliamentary members of the India Office Committee on the subject of the Rules, Orders and Practices in Indian Cantonments with regard to prostitution and contagious disease, hereby endorses their conclusions :

1. That the system and incidental practices described in that report and the statutory rules, so far as they authorized or permitted the same, did not accord with the plain meaning and intention of the resolution of the House of Commons of June 5th 1888 ; and,

2. That the only effective method of preventing these systematic malpractices is by express legislation.

8. That this *Congress*, concurring in the views set forth in previous *Congresses* affirms

That fully fifty millions of the population, a number yearly increasing, are dragging out a miserable existence on the verge of starvation, and that in every decade, several millions actually perish by starvation.

And humbly urges, once more, that immediate steps be taken to remedy this calamitous state of affairs.

9. That having regard to the very serious discontent created, especially in Peninsular India and in certain hilly tracts in the Punjab, by the practical administration of the Forest Laws, the Government of India be most respectfully, but earnestly, entreated to investigate this carefully and endeavour to mitigate its harshness and render it less obnoxious to the poorer classes.

10. That this *Congress* having on many previous occasions urged on the Government of India, the necessity for giving, as was promised by the British Government over thirty years ago, fixity and permanence to the Land Revenue demand, wherever this has not already been conceded, desires now to reiterate emphatically this recommendation and to call attention to the profound alarm which has been created by the action of Government in interfering with the existing permanent settlement in Bengal and Behar (in the matter of the survey and other cesses) and with the terms of the sanads of the permanently settled estates in Madras, and

deeming such tampering with solemn public pledges, no matter under what pretences, a national calamity, hereby pledges itself to oppose, in all possible legitimate ways, any and all such reactionary attacks on permanent settlements and their holders.

11. That this *Congress* regrets extremely that the Government of India have not only failed to carry out the pledges for a permanent settlement in the Provinces in which it does not exist (given by the Secretary of State in his despatches of 1862 and 1865) but have also failed to give effect to the policy of granting a modified fixity of tenure and immunity from enhancements, laid down in 1882 and 1884 by the Government of India, and approved by the Secretary of State.

12. That this *Congress* is of opinion that it is inexpedient in the present state of Education in the country, that Government grants for High Education should in any way be withdrawn, and concurring with previous *Congresses*, affirms in the most emphatic manner, the importance of increasing the public expenditure on all branches of Education, and the expediency (in view to the promotion of one of the most essential of those branches *i.e.*, the technical,) of appointing a mixed Commission to enquire into the present industrial condition of the country; and, looking to the great poverty of many classes of the community, strongly recommends, that in all classes of Government or Municipal Schools and Colleges, all fees shall be reduced in proportion to the means of parents and relations and remitted wholly in the case of very poor students; and, focussing the universal opinion of the Indian Community that undue stress is being laid at present upon mere mental development, this *Congress* earnestly recommends that henceforth, in all grades and classes of Schools and Colleges, at least equal attention should be devoted to the physical development of the students.

13. That this *Congress* regrets to notice that the Secretary of State for India in his recent despatch to the Government of India has enunciated the doctrine that occasions may arise in which it may be the duty of the Executive Government to criticise Judicial errors, the *Congress* being of opinion that such criticism is calculated to shake the confidence of the people in the independence of Judicial tribunals.

14. That this *Congress* places on record its deep regret at the recent hasty legislation of the Government of India closing the Indian mints against the private coinage of silver, whereby the people of this country have been subjected to further indirect taxation of a burdensome and indefinite character, and some of the most important trades and industries, notably the Mill industry, have been seriously disorganized and injured.

15. That this *Congress* records its emphatic protest against the Exchange Compensation Allowance granted to the undomiciled European and Eurasian *employes* of Government, involving an annual expenditure of over a crore of Rupees, and to the Banks, to the extent of £ 138,000 at a time when the financial situation of the country is far from satisfactory and the country is threatened with additional taxation.

16. That the Government of India be moved, once for all, to put a stop, by new and express legislation, (the existing provisions of the Penal Code having proved inoperative) to the existing oppressive system of forced labor (known as *Begar*) and forced contributions of supplies (known as *Rasad*) which, despite numerous Resolutions of the Government of India, are still prevalent throughout India.

17. That this *Congress* tenders its most sincere thanks to Lord Northbrook for his powerful advocacy of India's claim to have her burden of Home Charges reduced, and respectfully entreats the House of Commons to appoint at an early date a Committee of their Honourable House to arrive at some equitable settlement of the matter.

18. That in the opinion of this *Congress*, the time has now come to raise the status of the Chief Court of the Punjab to that of a Chartered High Court in the interest of the administration of Justice in that Province.

19. That this *Congress* tenders its best thanks to the Electors of Central Finsbury, both for their kindly sympathy in its objects and for having so generously accorded to it the valuable services of their honoured member Mr. Naoroji, who is destined, the *Congress* hopes, long to represent both Central Finsbury and India in the British House of Parliament.

20. That a sum of Rs. 60,000 be assigned for the expenses of the British Committee and the cost of the *Congress* Publication, "India," and that the several circles do contribute as arranged either now, or hereafter in Committee, for the year 1894.

21. That this *Congress* hereby tenders its most grateful acknowledgments to Sir W. Wedderburn and the members of the British Congress Committee for the services rendered by them to India during the past year.

22. That this *Congress* re-appoints Mr. A. O. Hume, C. B., to be its General Secretary for the ensuing year.

23. That the Tenth Indian National Congress do assemble on such day after Christmas Day 1894, as may be later determined upon, at Madras.

Tenth Congress—Madras—1894.

---

1. (*a*) That this *Congress* respectfully enters its emphatic protest against the injustice and impolicy of imposing excise duty on Cottons manufactured in British India, as such excise is calculated to cripple seriously the infant Mill Industry of this country.

(*b*) That this *Congress* puts on record its firm conviction that in proposing this excise the interests of India have been sacrificed to those of Lancashire, and it strongly deprecates any such surrender of Indian interests by the Secretary of State.

(*c*) That in case the Excise Bill becomes law this *Congress* earnestly prays that the Government of India will without delay seek the sanction of the Secretary of State to exercise the powers which the Bill confers on Government to exempt all Cottons from "twenties" to "twenty-fours" from the operation of the Act.

(*d*) That the President be authorized to telegraph the above Resolution to the Government of India and to the Secretary of State.

2. (*a*) That this *Congress* desires to express the profound alarm which has been created by the action of Government in interfering with the existing Permanent Settlement in Bengal and Behar (in the matter of Survey and other cesses) and with the terms of sunnads of permanently settled estates in Madras; and, deeming such interference with solemn pledges a national calamity, hereby pledges itself to oppose in all possible legitimate ways all such reactionary attacks on permanent settlements and their holders, and resolves to petition Parliament in that behalf.

(*b*) That this *Congress* regrets extremely that the Government of India have not only failed to carry out the pledges (given by the Secretary of State in his despatches of 1862 and 1865) for permanent settlement in the Provinces in which it does not exist, but have also failed to give effect to the policy of granting modified fixity of tenure and immunity from enhancements laid down in 1882 and 1884 by the Government of India and approved by the Secretary of State; and this *Congress* hereby entreats the Government of India to grant a modified fixity of tenure and immunity from enhancement of land-tax for a sufficiently long period of not less than sixty years so as to secure to landholders the full benefits of their own improvements.

3. That this *Congress*, concurring in the views set fourth in previous *Congresses*, affirms:
That fully fifty millions of the population, a number yearly increasing, are dragging out a miserable existence on the verge of starvation, and that in every decade, several millions actually perish by starvation.

And humbly urges, once more, that immediate steps be taken to remedy this calamitous state of affairs.

4. That this *Congress* considers the Abolition of the Council of the Secretary of State for India, as at present constituted, the necessary preliminary to all other reforms ; and suggests that in its place a Standing Committee of Members of the House of Commons be appointed.

5. That this *Congress*, while thanking Her Majesty's Government for the promise they have made to appoint a Select Committee of Members of Parliament to enquire into the financial expenditure of India, regards an enquiry with so limited a scope as inadequate, and is of opinion that if the enquiry is to bear any practical fruit it must include an enquiry into the ability of the Indian people to bear their existing financial burdens and into the financial relations between India and the United Kingdom.

6. (*a*) That this *Congress* expresses its deep sense of disappointment at the despatch of the Secretary of State supporting the views of the Government of India on the question of Simultaneous Examinations, and this *Congress* hereby places on record its respectful but firm protest against the despatch, as, among other things, introducing a new principle inconsistent with the Charter Act of 1833 and the Proclamation of the Queen of 1st November 1858 (the solemn pledges contained in which the Secretary of State and the Government of India now seek to repudiate) by creating a disability founded upon race, for the despatch lays down that a minimum of European officials in the Covenanted Service is indispensable.

(*b*) That in the opinion of this *Congress* the creation of the Provincial service is no satisfactory or permanent solution of the problem, as this service, constituted as it is at present, falls short of the legitimate aspirations of the people, and the interests of the subordinate service will not suffer by the concession of Simultaneous Examinations.

(*c*) That no attempt has been made to make out a case against the holding of Simultaneous Examinations for the recruitment of the Engineering, Forest, Telegraph and the higher Police Service Examinations, and the *Congress* regrets to notice that the despatches of the Secretary of State, the Government of India, and the various local Governments are absolutely silent with regard to this aspect of the Resolution of the House of Commons.

(*d*) That this *Congress* respectfully urges on Her Majesty's Government that the Resolution of the House of Commons of 2nd June 1893 on the question of Simultaneous Examinations should be speedily carried out as an act of justice to the Indian people.

7. That this *Congress* views with great dissatisfaction the system of recruiting the higher Judicial Service of the country, and is of opinion that provision should be made for proper Judicial training being given to persons who are appointed to the post of District and Sessions Judge, and that the higher Judicial Service in Bengal, the N. W. P. and Oudh, Bombay and Madras, and the Judicial Service generally in other parts of the country, should be more largely recruited from the legal profession than is now the case.

8. (*a*) That this *Congress* is of opinion that the present constitution of the Higher Civil Medical Service is anomalous, indefensible in principle, injurious in its working, and unnecessarily costly ; that the time has arrived when in the interests of Public Medical Education, and the advancement of Medical Service and of scientific work in the country, as also in the cause of economic administration, the Civil Medical Service of India should be reconstructed on the basis of such service in other civilized countries, wholly detached from and independent of the Military Service.

(*b*) That the very unsatisfactory position and prospects of Members of the Subordinate Civil Medical Service (Assistant-Surgeons and Civil Hospital Assistants) compared with members of similar standing in other departments of the Public Service, require thorough investigation and redress, and pray that Government will grant for the purpose an open enquiry by a mixed Commission of official and non-official members.

(c) That whilst this *Congress* views with satisfaction the desire of the Imperial Government to re-organise the Chemical Analyser's department with a view to its administration as an independent scientific department, it earnestly hopes that Government will not fail to recognise the responsible and meritorious work of Assistant, or as they in reality are, Government Chemical Analysers, and place them on the footing of Specialists.

9. (a) That this *Congress*, in concurrence with the Preceding *Congresses*, considers that the creation of a Legislative Council for the Province of the Punjab is an absolute necessity for the good Government of that Province, and having regard to the fact that a Legislative Council, has been created for the N. W. Provinces, urges that no time be lost in creating such a Council for the Punjab.

(b) That this *Congress*, in concurrence with the preceding *Congress*, is of opinion that the rules now in force under the Indian Councils Act of 1892 are materially defective, and prays that His Excellency the Viceroy in Council will be pleased to have fresh rules framed in a liberal spirit, with a view to a better working of the Act, and suited to the conditions and requirements of each Province.

10. That this *Congress* wishes to express its respectful condolence and sympathy with the royal family of Mysore in their recent sad and sudden bereavement, and at the same time to testify to its deep sense of the loss which has been sustained in the death of the Maharajah of Mysore, not only by the State over which he ruled with such wisdom, ability and beneficence, but also by all the Indian peoples, to whom his constitutional reign was at once vindication of their political capacity, an example for their active emulation, and an earnest of their future political liberties.

11. (a) That, in the opinion of this *Congress*, the time has now arrived when the system of trial by Jury may be safely extended, in cases triable by Sessions Courts, to many parts of the country where it is not at present in force.

(b) That, in the opinion of this *Congress* the innovation made in 1872 in the system of trial by Jury, depriving the verdicts of Juries of all finality, has proved injurious to the country, and that the powers, then, for the first time, vested in Sessions Judges and High Courts, of setting aside verdicts of acquittal, should be at once withdrawn.

(c) That in the opinion of this *Congress* it is extremely desirable that the power at present vested in Government to appeal against acquittals be taken away.

12. That this *Congress* having till now vainly appealed for many successive years to the Government of India, and also to the Secretary of State, to remove one of the gravest defects in the system of administration and one fraught with incalculable oppression to all classes of people throughout the country, and having noted with satisfaction the admission of the evil by two former Secretaries of State (Lord Kimberley and Lord Cross), and being of opinion that the reform is thoroughly practicable, as has been shown by Messrs. R. C. Dutt, M. M. Ghose and P. M. Mehta, entreats the Government of India to direct the immediate appointment in each Province of a Committee (one-half at least of whose members shall be non-official natives of India, qualified by education and experience in the workings of various Courts to deal with the question) to prepare a scheme for the complete separation of all Judicial and Executive functions in their own province with as little additional cost to the State as may be practicable, and the submission of such schemes, with the opinions of the several Governments thereon, at an early date.

13. That this *Congress* re-affirms the opinion of the preceding *Congress* that the time has now come to raise the status of the Chief Court of the Punjab to that of a Chartered High Court in the interests of the administration of justice in this Province.

14. That having regard to the fact that the embarrassed condition of the finances of the country has been giving cause for grave anxiety for some years past, this *Congress* records its

firm conviction that the only remedy for the present state of things is a material curtailment in the expenditure on the Army Services and other Military Expenditure, Home Charges, and the cost of Civil Administration, and in view of the proposed appointment of a Parliamentary Committee to investigate the subject this *Congress* strongly recommends that the Standing Congress Committees of the several Presidencies and Provinces should, so far as practicable make arrangements to send to England at least one well qualified delegate from each Presidency or Province to urge such reduction before the Committee.

15. That this *Congress* is emphatically of opinion that it is inexpedient in the present state of education in the country that Government grants for higher education should in any way be withdrawn, and, concurring with previous *Congresses* affirms in the most emphatic, manner the importance of increasing public expenditure on all branches of education and the expediency of establishing Technical Schools and Colleges.

16. That this *Congress* concurs with its predecessors in strongly advocating :—

(*a*) The reduction of the Salt duty by at least the amount of its latest enhancement

(*b*) The raising of the Income-tax taxable minimum from five hundred to one thousand Rupees ;

(*c*) The persistent pressure by the Government of India on all provincial administrations to induce them to carry out in its integrity the excise policy enunciated in paragraphs 103, 104, 105, of the Despatch published in the *Gazette of India* of March 1890, and the introduction of a simple system of local option in the case of all villages ;

(*d*) The introduction into the Code of Criminal Procedure of a provision enabling accused persons in warrant cases to demand that instead of being tried by the Magistrate they may be committed to the Court of Sessions ;

(*e*) The fundamental reform of the Police Administration by a reduction in the numbers and an increase in the salaries and the qualifications of the lower grades, and their far more careful enlistment ; and by the selection for the higher posts of gentlemen of higher capacities, more in touch with the respectable portions of the community, and less addicted to Military pretentions, than the majority of existing Deputy Inspectors-General, Superintendents and Assistant Superintendents of Police are at present ;

(*f*) A modification of the rules under the Arms Act so as to make them equally applicable to all residents in, or visitors to, India without distinction of creed, caste, or colour ; to ensure the liberal concession of licenses wherever wild animals habitually destroy human life, cattle, or crops ; and to make all licenses, granted under the revised rules, of life-long tenure, revocable only on proof of misuse, and valid throughout the Provincial jurisdiction in which they are issued ;

(*g*) The establishment of Military Colleges in India, whereat, natives of India, as defined by statute, may be educated and trained for a military career, as Commissioned or non-Commissioned officers (according to capacity and qualifications) in the Indian army ;

(*h*) The organizing throughout the more warlike races of the empire of a system of militia service.

(*i*) The authorizing and stimulating of a widespread system of volunteering, such as obtains in Great Britain, amongst the people of India ;

(*j*) The discontinuance of the Exchange Compensation allowance granted to undomiciled European and Eurasian employes of Government, involving an annual expenditure of over a crore of rupees while the Exchequer is in a condition of chronic embarrassment ;

(*k*) The giving effect to the report of the Parliamentary Members of the India Office Committee on the subject of the Rules, Orders, and Practices in Indian Cantonments, with regard to prostitution and contagious disease, and the endorsing of their conclusions ; —

(i) That the system and incidental practices described in that Report, and the statutory

rules, so far as they authorized or permitted the same, did not accord with the plain meaning and intention of the resolution of the House of Commons of June 5th, 1888 ; and

(ii) That the only effective method of preventing these systematic malpractices is by express legislation.

17. That this Congress hereby empowers its President to convey to the Government of India its opinion that the powers proposed to be conferred on District Magistrates, by amendments and additions to section 15 of Police Act V of 1861, with respect to the levy of the costs of punitive police and of granting compensation, are of a most arbitrary, dangerous, and unprecedented character.

18. That this Congress records its deep-felt gratitude to the Government of India for its circular resolution No. 22/F, published in the Supplement to the *Gazette of India*, dated 20th October 1894, and its high appreciation of the generous principle, which it enunciates, of subordinating fiscal interests to the needs and agricultural interests of the ryot population in the management of forests.

And would further represent that in forests falling under classes 3 and 4 of the said resolutions, fuel, grazing concessions, fodder, small timber for building houses and making agricultural implements, edible forest products, &c., may be granted free of charge in all cases, under such restrictions as to quantity, &c., as the Government may deem proper ; and that wherever hardship may be felt, under present conditions, the policy of the said Resolution may be carried out with reference to existing Forest areas, and the existing Reserve boundaries so adjusted as to leave a sufficiently large margin to facilitate the enjoyment by the agricultural population of their communal rights without molestation and annoyance by the minor subordinates of the Department.

19. That this Congress, being of opinion that the Government of India Notification of 25th June 1891 in the Foreign Department, gagging the Press in territories under British administration in Native States, is retrograde, arbitrary, and mischieveous in its nature, and opposed to sound statesmanship and to the liberty of the people, most respectfully enters its emphatic protest against the same and entreats its cancellation without delay.

20. That this Congress views with apprehension the arbitrary policy of the Government of India with regard to the imposition of water-cess, introducing as it does a disturbing element in taxation, and suggests that the imposition of the said cess be regulated by certain defined principles affording security to the rights of landowners and of persons investing money in land.

21. That this Congress earnestly entreats Her Majesty's Government to grant the prayer of Her Majesty's Indian subjects, resident in the South African Colonies, by vetoing the Bill of the Colonial Government disenfranchising them.

22. That a deputation consisting of the following gentlemen be appointed for the purpose of presenting Resolutions numbered 1, 2, 3, 6, 7, 8, 9, 11, 12, 13, 14, 15, 16, 17, 18, 19, 20 and 21 to His Excellency Lord Elgin ; and that the British Committee of the National Congress be requested to arrange a similar deputation to wait upon the Secretary of State for India in London.

From Bengal and Behar :—His Highness the Maharajah Bahadur of Durbhanga, Sir Romesh Chunder Mitter, *Kt.*, The Honorable Mr. W. C. Bonnerjee, The Honorable Mr. Surrendra Nath Banerjea, Mr. J. Ghosal, Babu Saligram Sing, Mr. Shurefuddin, Rai Jotentranath Chaudhuri and Babu Boikunt Nath Sen. *From the North-West Provinces*:—The Honorable Rajah Rampal Singh and the Honorable Baboo Charoo Chandra Mitter. *From Oudh* :— Sheikh Rajah Hussein Khan, Mr. Hamid Ali Khan and Baboo Gokal Chand. *From the Punjab*:—Sirdar Dayal Sing Majithia, Baboo Kali Prasanna Roy, Mr. Jussawala, Shaik Umar

Buksh, Lala Murlidhar and Bakshi Jaishi Ram. *From Bombay*:—The Honorable Mr. P. M. Mehta, C. I. E. *From the Central Provinces*:—The Honorable Mr. G. M. Chitnavis and Rai Bahadur C. Narainswami Naidu. *From Poona* :—Rao Bahadur V. M. Bhide, Mr. S. B. Bhate Mr. N. B. Mule and Mr. P. L. Nagpurkar. *From Berar* :—Rao Saheb Deerao Vinayek. *From Madras*:—Manivikram Rajah of Calicut, The Honorable Mr. Sabapathy Mudaliar Rai Bahadur P. Ananda Charlu and Mr. G. Subramania Iyer."

23. That a sum of Rs. 60,000 be assigned for the expenses of the British Committee and the cost of the Congress publication, "India," and that the several circles do contribute as arranged, either now, or hereafter in Committee, for the year 1895.

24. That this *Congress* hereby tenders its most grateful thanks to Sir W. Wedderburn and the other members of the British Congress Committee for the services rendered by them to India during the present year.

25. That this *Congress* re-appoints Mr. A. O. Hume, C. B., to be its General Secretary for the ensuing year.

26. That the eleventh Indian National Congress do assemble on such day after Christmas day, 1895, as may be later determined upon, at Poona.

27. That this Congress is of opinion that the time has come when the constitution of the Congress should be settled, and rules and regulations laid down as to the number of Delegates, their qualifications, the localities for assemblage, and the like, and with this view the Congress requests the Standing Congress Committee of Poona to draw up draft rules and circulate them among the different Standing Congress Committees for their report; these reports, together with the draft rules and the report thereon to be laid before the next Congress for its consideration.

Eleventh Congress—Poona—1894.

1. That the draft rules in regard to the constitution and working of the Indian National Congress, as framed by the Poona Congress Committee in accordance with the resolution, in that behalf, of the last Congress, be circulated by the Poona Committee to all the Standing Congress Committees, with instructions to report to the General Secretary and the Standing Counsel at least three months before the next Congresss.

2. That this Congress is of opinion that the enquiry by the Expenditure Commission will not be satisfactory to the people of this country, nor be of any practical advantage, to the Government, unless the lines of policy which regulate expenditure are enquired into, and unless facilities are afforded and arrangements made for receiving evidence other than official and Anglo-Indian. And this Congress also feels that the enquiry would, in all probability, yield better results, if the proceedings were conducted with open doors.

3. That this Congress again records its firm conviction that in view of the embarrassed condition of the finances of the country, the only remedy for the present state of things is a material curtailment in the expenditure. on the Army Services and other military expenditure, Home Charges and the cost of Civil Administation ; and it notices with satisfaction that expert opinion in England has now come over to the view of the Indian Parliamentary Committee that growth in military expenditure is a more potent cause of Indian financial embarrassment than the condition of exchange.

4. That this Congress again appeals to the Government of India and the Secretary of State to take practical steps for the purpose of carrying out the separation of Judicial from Executive functions in the administration of justice.

5. That this Congress views with alarm the constant changes that are being made and threatened on the subject of trial by Jury in this country, and, regard being had to the fact

that no demand for any such change has been made by any portion of the population of British India, trusts that the Bill now before the Supreme Legislative Council on the subject will not be further proceeded with; and this Congress, reaffirming resolutions passed by former Congresses, also trusts that trials by Jury will be extended to districts and offences to which the system at present does not apply and that their verdicts should be final.

6. That this Congress, being of opinion that the Government of India Notification of 25th June 1891 in the Foreign Department, gagging the Press in territories under British administration in Native States, is retrograde, arbitrary and mischievous in its nature and opposed to sound statesmanship and to the liberty of the people, again enters its emphatic protest against the same and urges its cancellation without delay.

7. That this Congress, concurring with previous Congresses, again records its deep regret that the labours of the Public Service Commission have practically proved void of any good results to the people of this country, and repeats its conviction that no satisfactory solution of the question is possible, unless effect is given to the resolution of the House of Commons of June 1893 in favour of holding the competitive examinations for the Indian Civil Services simultaneously in India and England.

8. That in view of the great extensions of the British power on the North-West and North-East of the proper frontiers of India into regions not contemplated by Parliament when it passed Section 56 of the Government of India Act, the Congress is of opinion that over and above the sanction of Parliament necessary before the revenue and forces of India are employed outside the frontiers of India, the interests of India absolutely demand that the expenses of all such expeditions should be shared between England and India. Without some such additional guarantee, the forward Military policy will involve India in hopeless financial confusion.

9. That the Congress deems it necessary to record its most solemn protest against the disabilities sought to be imposed on Indian settlers in South Africa, and it earnestly hopes that the British Government and the Government of India will come forward to guard the interests of these settlers in the same spirit in which they have always interfered, whenever the interests of their British-born subjects have been at stake.

10. That: in the opinion of this Congress, any proposal to restrict the right of private alienation of lands by legislation as a remedy for the relief of agricultural indebtedness will be a most retrograde measure, and will, in its distant consequences, not only check improvement but reduce the agricultural population to a condition of still greater helplessness. The indebtedness of the agriculturist classes arises partly from their ignorance and partly from the application of a too rigid system of fixed revenue assessments which takes little account of the fluctuating conditions of agriculture in many parts of India; and the true remedy must be sought in the spread of general education and a relaxation of the rigidity of the present system of revenue collections in those parts of the country where the permanent settlement does not obtain.

11. That the Congress notes with satisfaction that the right of interpellation, vested in non-official members of the Legislative Councils, has, on the whole, been exercised in a spirit of moderation, which has secured the approval of the authorities here and in England; and the Congress, being of opinion that the practical utility of interpellations would be greatly enhanced, if the members putting them were allowed to preface their questions by a short explanation of the reasons for them, urges that the right to make such explanations ought to be granted.

12. (*a*) That this Congress notices with satisfaction that its views in regard to the urgency and lines of reform in regard to the condition of the Civil and Military Medical Services of the country are being endorsed in influential Medical and Military circles, and

that in the interests of the public, Medical Science and the profession, as also in the cause o economic administration, this Congress once again affirms (1) that there should be only one Military Medical Service with two branches, one for the European army and the other for native troops, worked on identical lines ; (2) that the Civil Medical Service of the country should be reconstituted a distinct and independent Medical Service, wholly detached from its present Military connection, and recruited from the open profession of Medicine in India and elsewhere, with a due leaning to the utilisation of indigenous talent, other things being equal.

(*b*) That this Congress further affirms that the status and claims of Civil Assistant Surgeons and Hospital Assistants require thorough and open inquiry with a view to the redressing of long-standing anomalies and consequent grievances ; and the Congress notices with regret that in their recent scheme of the reorganisation of the Chemical Analyser's department the oft-admitted claims of Assistant Chemical Analysers have been apparently overlooked by Government.

13. That this Congress, while fully sympathising with any genuine effort which the Government may make for the suppression of law-touts, views with grave alarm those provisions of the Bill to amend the Legal Practitioners' Act, now pending the consideration of the Supreme Legislative Council, which propose to invest District Judges and Revenue Commissioners with the power of dismissing legal practitioners and, in cases coming under the Act, to throw the entire burden of proving their innocence upon the latter ; and this Congress, being of opinion that the provisions of the Bill are calculated to prejudicially affect the independence of the Bar and to lower the position of legal practitioners in the eyes of the public without, in any way, helping to suppress law-touts or to further the ends of justice, urges that it should be dropped.

14. That this Congress expresses its firm conviction that in the interests of the country it is absolutely necessary that there should be greater fixity in the tenure on which land is held in the temporarily settled districts than exists at present, and that Government should impose on its own action restrictions against enhancement of assessment similar to those which it has deemed necessary in the interests of tenants to impose upon the rights of private landlords in permanently settled estates.

15. That this Congress puts on record its emphatic protest against the retrograde policy that the Government of India have this time followed in nominating a gentleman for the Central Provinces to the Supreme Legislative Council without asking Local Bodies to make recommendations for such nomination and earnestly hopes that Government will be pleased to take early steps to give to the Central Provinces the same kind of representation that it has already granted to Bengal, Madras, Bombay and the N. W. Provinces.

16. That this Congress repeats the resolutions of the last two years against the gran of Exchange Compensation allowance to the undomiciled European and Eurasian employees of Government involving now an annual expenditure of ove a crore and a half of rupees.

17. That this Congress, while thanking the Government of India for recognising the grievances of third class Railway Passengers, from whom the largest portion of railway revenue is derived, in their recent resolutions on the subject, desires to express its hope that Government will take effective steps to bring about an early redress of those grievances.

18. That this Congress is of opinion that the action of the Forest Department, under the rules framed by the different Provincial Governments prejudicially affects the inhabitants of the rural parts of the country by subjecting them to the annoyance and oppression of forest subordinates in various ways which have led to much discontent throughout the country. The objects of forest conservancy, as announced in the resolution of 1894, are decleared to be not to secure the largest revenue but to conserve the forests in the interest chiefly of the agricultural classes and of their cattle. The existing set of

rules subordinate the latter consideration to the former and an amendment of the rules with a view to correct the mischief is, in the opinion of the Congress, urgently called for.

19. That this Congress tenders its thanks to the Secretary of State for India for his promise of September last to take an early opportunity to reduce the Salt Duty, and, concurring with previous Congresses, once more places on record its sense of the great hardship which the present rate of salt taxation imposes upon the poorest classes of the country—a hardship which renders it incumbent on Government to take the first opportunity to restore the duty to its level of 1888.

20. That this Congress is emphatically of opinion that it is inexpedient in the present state of education in the country that Government grants for Higher Education should in any way be withdrawn, or that fees in educational institutions, wholly or partially supported by the State, should be increased, and concurring with previous Congresses, affirms in the most emphatic manner the importance of increasing public expenditure on all branches of education and the expediency of establishing Technical Schools and Colleges.

21. That this Congress is of opinion that the objection taken by Lancashire manufacturers to the exemption of Indian yarns below 20s from excise duty is not well-founded, and trusts that the Government of India will stand firm in its policy of levying import duties for revenue purposes, as such levy does not conflict in any way with principles of free trade.

22. That this Congress concurs with its predecessors in strongly advocating :

(*a*) The raising of the Income-Tax taxable minimum from five hundred to one thousand rupees ;

(*b*) Persistent pressure by the Government of India on all Provincial Administrations to induce them to carry out in its integrity the excise policy enunciated in paragraphs 103, 104, 105, of the Despatch, published in the *Gazette of India* of March 1890, and the introduction of a simple system of local option in the case of all villages ;

(*c*) The introduction into the Code of Criminal Procedure of a provision enabling accused persons in warrant cases to demand that instead of being tried by the Magistrate, they may be committed to the Court of Sessions ;

(*d*) The taking of immediate steps to improve the lot of the poorer classes in India, fully fifty milions of the population—a number yearly increasing, dragging out a miserable, existence on the verge of starvation, and several millions actually perishing, in every decade, by starvation ;

(*e*) A modification of the rules under the Arms Act so as to make them equally applicable to all residents in, or visitors to, India without distinction of creed, caste or colour ; to ensure the liberal concession of licenses wherever wild animals habitually destroy human life, cattle, or crops ; and to make all licenses, granted under the revised rules, of life-long tenure, revocable only on proof of misuse, and valid throughout the Provincial jurisdiction in which they are issued ;

(*f*) The establishment of Military Colleges in India, whereat, natives of India, as defined by statute, may be educated and trained for a military career, as Commissioned or non-Commissioned officers (according to capacity and qualifications) in the Indian army ;

(*g*) The organizing throughout the more warlike races of the empire of a system of military service :

(*h*) The authorizing and stimulating of a widespread system of volunteering, such as obtains in Great Britain, amongst the people of India ;

(*i*) The regulation of the imposition of the Water-cess by certain defined principles, affording security to the rights of land-owners and of persons investing money in land.

23. That a sum of Rs. 60,000 be assigned for the expenses of the British Committee

and the cost of the Congress publication, "India," and also for the expenses of the Joint-General Secretary's office, and that the several circles do contribute as arranged, either now, or hereafter in Committee, for the year 1896.

24. That this Congress hereby tenders its most grateful thanks to Sir W. Wedderburn and the other members of the British Congress Committee for the services rendered by them to India during the present year.

25. That this Congress reappoints Mr. A. O. Hume, C.B., to be its General Secretary, and appoints Mr. D. E. Wacha to be its Joint-General Secretary for the ensuing year.

26. That the Twelfth Congress do assemble on such day after Christmas day 1896, as may be later determined upon, at Calcutta.

Twelfth Congress—Calcutta—1896.

1. That this Congress desires to place on record its humble congratulations on Her Gracious Majesty, the Queen Empress, having attained the sixtieth year of her reign, the longest and the most beneficent in the annals of the Empire—a reign associated with the most important advances in human happiness and civilization. The Congress expresses the hope that Her Majesty may long be spared to reign over her people.

2. That this Congress desires to convey to Sir William Wedderburn and the other members of the British Committee its most grateful thanks for their disinterested services in the cause of Indian Political Advancement and accords its hearty welcome to Mr. W. S. Caine as the Delegate of the British Committee to this Congress.

3. That this Congress notices with satisfaction the support of public opinion both in England and in India which the question of the separation of Judicial from Executive functions in the administration of justice has received; and this Congress once again appeals to the Government of India and the Secretary of State, to take practical steps for speedily carrying out this much-needed reform. In this connection the Congress desires to record its deep regret at the death of Mr. Mon Mohun Ghose who made this question the subject of his special study.

4. Considering that the Local Governments are entrusted with all branches of administration, excepting Army expenditure, superior supervision and control here and in England, and the payment of interest on debt, this Congress is of opinion that the allotments made to the Provincial Governments on what is called the provincial adjustments are inadequate, and that in view of the revision of the Quinquennial Provincial Contract, which is to take place in 1897, the time has arrived when a further step should be taken in the matter of financial decentralization, by leaving the responsibility of the financial administration of the different Provinces principally to the Local Governments; the Supreme Government receiving from each Local Government only a fixed contribution levied in accordance with some definite and equitable principle, which should not be liable to any disturbance during the currency of the period of contract, so as to secure to Local Governments that fiscal certainty, and that advantage arising from the moral expansion of the revenues which are so essential to all real progress in the development of the resources and the satisfactory administration of the different provinces.

5. That this Congress concurring with previous Congresses again records its deep regret that the labours of the Public Service Commission have practically proved void of any good result to the people of this country, and repeats its conviction that no satisfactory solution of the question is possible unless effect is given to the Resolution of the House of Commons of the 2nd June 1893, in favour of holding the competitive examinations for the Indian Civil Services, *viz.*, Civil, Medical, Police Engineering, Telegraph, Forest, and

Accounts, both in India and in England. This Congress would once again respectfully urge on Her Majesty's Government that the Resolution of the House of Commons should be speedily carried out as an act of justice to the Indian people and as the only adequate fulfilment of the pledges made to them.

6. That this Congress hereby records its protest against the scheme reorganizing the Educational Service which has just received the sanction of the Secretary of State, as being calculated to exclude natives of India, including those who have been educated in England, from the superior grade of the Education Service to which they have hitherto been admitted ; for in the words of the Resolution :—" In future Natives of India who are desirous of entering the Educational Department wil usually be appointed in India, and to the Provincial service " The Congress prays that the scheme may be so recast as to afford facilities for the admission of Indian graduates to the superior grade of the Educational Service.

7. That this Congress having regard to the opinion of the Jury Commission as to the success of the system of Trial by Jury, and to the fact that with the progress of education a sufficient number of educated persons is available in all parts of the country, and concurriug with previous Congresses, is of opinion that Trial by Jury should be extended to districts and offences to which the system at present does not apply, and that the verdicts should be final.

8. That this Congress once again places on record its sense of the great hardship which the present rate of Salt tax imposes upon the poorest classes of the country, a hardship which renders it incumbent upon the Government to take the earliest opportunity to restore the duty to the level of 1868.

9. That this Congress once again deems it necessary to record its most solemn protest against the disabilities imposed on Indian settlers in South Africa and the invidious and humiliating distinctions made between them and European settlers, and appeals to Her Majesty's Government and the Government of India to guard the interests of Indian settlers and to relieve them of the disabilities to which they are subjected.

10. (*a*) That this Congress notices with satisfaction that its views in connection with the urgency and the lines of reform in regard to the condition of the Civil and Military Medical Services of the country have been endorsed in influential Medical and Military circles, and in the interests of the public, the Medical Science and the profession, as also in the cause of economic administration, this Congress once again affirms (1) that there should be only one Military Medical Service with two branches, one for the European army and the other for native troops, worked on identical lines and (2) that the Civil Medical Service of the country should be reconstituted as a distinct and independent Medical Service, wholly detached from its present Military connection, and recruited from the open profession of Medicine in India and elsewhere, with due regard to the utilisation of indigenous talent, other things being equal.

(*b*) That the Congress further affirms that the status and claims of Civil Assistant Surgeons and Hospital Assistants require thorough and open inquiry with a view to the redressing of long-standing anomalies and consequent grievances.

11. That this Congress concurs with its predecessors in strongly advocating :—

(*a*) Persistent pressure by the Government of India on all Provincial Administrations to induce them to carry out in its integrity the excise policy enunciated in paragraphs 103, 104 and 105 of the Despatch published in the Gazette of India of March 1890, and the introduction of a simple system of effective local option ;

(*b*) The introduction into the Code of Criminal Procedure of a provision enabling accused persons in warrant cases to demand that instead of being tried by the Magistrate

they may be committed to the Court of Sessions ;

(*c*) A modification of the rules under the Arms Act so as to make them equally applicable to all residents in, or visitors to India without distinction of creed, caste or colour ; to ensure the liberal concession of licenses wherever wild animals habitually destroy human life, cattle or crops ; and to make all licenses, granted under the revised rules, of life-long tenure revocable only on proof of misuse, and valid throughout the Provincial jurisdiction in which they are issued ;

(*d*) The establishment of Military Colleges in India, whereat Natives of India, as defined by Statute, may be educated and trained for a military career, as Commissioned or non-Commissioned officers (according to capacity and qualifications) in the Indian army ;

(*e*) The authorizing and stimulating of a widespread system of volunteering, such as obtains in Great Britain, amongst the people of India ;

(*f*) The discontinuance of the grant of Exchange Compensation Allowance to the non-domiciled European and Eurasian employees of Government ;

(*g*) The abolition of the Council of the Secretary of State for India ;

(*h*) The establishment of a High Court of Judicature and a Provincial Legislative Council in the Punjab ;

(*i*) The withdrawal of the Government of India Notification of 25th June 1891 in the Foreign Department, gagging the Press in Territories under British administration in Native States, as being retrograde, arbitrary and mischievous in its nature and opposed to sound statesmanship and to the liberty of the people.

12. That this Congress deplores the out-break of famine in a more or less acute form throughout India and holds that this and other famines which have occurred in recent years are due to the great poverty of the people, brought on by the drain of the wealth of the country which has been going on for years together, and by the excessive taxation and over-assessment, consquent on a policy of extravagance, followed by the Government both in the Civil and the Military departments, which has so far impoverished the people that at the first touch of scarcity they are rendered helpless and must perish unless fed by the State or helped by private charity. In the opinion of this Congress the true remedy against the recurrence of famine lies in the adoption of a policy which would enforce economy, husband the resources of the State, foster the development of indigenous and local arts and industries which have practically been extinguished, and help forward the introduction of modern arts and industries.

In the meantime the Congress would remind the Government of its solemn duty to save human life and mitigate human suffering, (the provisions of the existing Famine Code being in the opinion of the Congress inadeqnate as regards wages and rations, and oppressive as regards task work,) and would appeal to the Government to redeem its pledges by restoring the Famine Insurance Fund (keeping a separate account of it) to its original footing and to apply it more largely to its original purpose, *viz.* the immediate relief of the famines tricken people.

That in view of the fact that private charity in England is ready to flow freely into this country at this awful juncture, and considering that large classes of sufferers can only be reached by private charity, this Congress desires to enter its most emphatic protest against the manner in which the Government of India is at present blocking the way, and this Congress humbly ventures to express the hope that the disastrous mistake committed by Lord Lytton's Government in the matter will not be repeated on this occasion.

13. That this Congress once again would desire to call the attention of the Government to the deplorable condition of the poorer classes in India, full forty millions of whom according to high official authority drag out a miserable existence on the verge of starva-

tion even in normal years, and the Congress would recommend the following amongst other measures for the amelioration of their condition :—

1. That the Permanent Settlement be extended to those parts of the country where it does not exist at the present time, and restrictions be put on over-assessments in those parts of India where it may not be advisabie to extend the Permanent Settlement at the present time, so as to leave the Ryots sufficient to maintain themselves.

2. That Agricultural Banks be established and that greater facilities be accorded for obtaining loans under the Agricultural Loans Act.

3. That the minimum income assessable under the Income-tax Act be raised from five hundred to one thousand.

4. That technical schools be established and local and indigenous manufactures fostered.

14. That the time having come when greater facilities are imperatively required for higher education and the proper development of the Indian intellect than what are at present offered by examinations alone, this Congress is of opinion that the Acts of Incorporation of the Universities of Calcutta, Madras and Bombay should be amended so as to provide for the introduction of teaching functions and for a wider scope of learning, and so as to suit generally the requirements of the present day.

15. That having regard to the facility of intercourse between all parts of India and Assam this Congress is of opinion that the time has now arrived when the Inland Emigration Act I of 1882 as amended by Act VII of 1893 should be repealed.

16. That having regard to the wisdom of the policy of appointing to the Governorships of Madras and Bombay, statesmen from England to the exclusion of the Services in India, and in view to the utilisatiou by those Governors of the power of giving when necessary a casting vote allowed them by law, this Congress is of opinion that it is desirable that the Executive Governments of those Provinces should be administered by the Governors with Councils of three members and not of two members as at present, and that one of the three Councillors must be other than a member of the Indian Civil Service., and in view to carrying out the object without additional cost, this Congress would suggest that the officers commanding the forces of those Presidencies be declared members of the respective Councils as the Commanders-in-Chief of Madras and Bombay were, before the Madras and Bombay Armies Act of 1893 was passed.

17. That this Congress enters its emphatic protest against the policy of Government, in provinces where the Settlement of Land Revenue is periodical, to repuce the duration of the settlement to shorter periods than had been the case till now, and prays that the settlement should be guaranteed for long periods, at least for sixty years.

18, That in the opinion oi this Congress it is desirable that in future no Indian Prince or Chief shall be deposed on the ground of maladministration or misconduct until the fact of such maladministration or miceonduct shall have been established to the satisfaction of a Public Tribunal which shall command the confidence alike of Government and of the Indian Princes and Chiefs.

19. That this Congress puts on record its emphatic protest against the retrograde policy of the Government of India followed last year in nominating a gentlemen for the Central Provinces to the Supreme Legislative Council without asking local bodies to make recommendations for such nomination, and earnestly hopes that Government will be pleased to take early steps to give to the Cenetral Provinces the same kind of representation that it has already granted to Bengal, Madras, Bombay and the North Western Provinces.

20. That this Congress desires to place on record its sense of satisfaction at the delegation by the Bombay Presidency Association of Mr. Dinshaw Eduljee Wacha, Joint

General Secretary of the Congress, to give evidence before the Royal Commission on Expenditure, and the Congress has full confidence that Mr. Wacha will give accurate and adequate expression to its views on the questions which form the subject of enquiry

21. That this Congress again expresses its full and unabated confidence in Mr. Dadabhai Naoroji as the representative of the people of India and hopes that he will be re-elected by his old constituency of Central Finsbury or any other Liberal constituency.

22. That a sum of Rupees sixty thousand be assigned for the expenses of the British Committee and cost of the Congress Publication "India" and also for the expenses of the Joint General Secretary's Office, and that the several circles do contribute as arranged, either now, or hereafter in committee, for the year 1897.

23. That this Congress reappoints Mr. A. O. Hume to be General Secretary, and Mr. D. E. Wacha to be Joint General Secretary for the ensuing year.

24. That the Thirteenth Congress do assemble on such day after Christmas Day 1897, as may be later determined upon, at Amraoti, Berar.

Thirteenth Congress—Amraoti—1897.

1. That this Congress expresses its deep and earnest conviction that the present Frontier policy of the Government of India is injurious to the best interests of the British Empire in general, and this country in particular, as it involves frequent Military expeditions beyond the present limits of the British Indian Empire and causes great loss of valuable lives and public money: and therefore entreats the British Nation to put a stop to this aggressive policy and to lay down that if such expeditions are found necessary they being for Imperial purposes, the major portion of their expenses should be defrayed by the British Exchequer.

2. That in view of the fact that the calamities of famine and plague have dislocated the already seriously embarrassed finances of this country and crippled its limited resources, and that the Military operations carried on beyond the North-West Frontier are for the protection of Imperial interests, this Congress prays that the British Parliament will, pending the settlement of the principle on which the Military charges are to be apportioned between Great Britain and India, be pleased to make a substantial contribution to the cost of the present war.

2*a*. That this Congress authorizes the President to submit a petition to Parliament embodying the prayer contained in Resolutions 1 and 2 under his hand on its behalf.

3. That this Congress rejoices that the Royal Commission on Indian Expenditure was pleased to decide to admit the public toits proceedings, and further desires to express its grateful acknowledgments for the opportunity afforded by the Honourable Commission to representative Indian witnesses to state fully the case on behalf of India. With regard to the three divisions of the reference the Congress desires most respectfully to submit the following prayers for the favourable consideration of the Honourable Commission :—

(i) As regards the Machinery to control Indian Expenditure, it is prayed—(1) that the non-official Members of the Viceroy's Council may be made more directly representative of the Indian people, and that they may have the right to move amendments and divide the Council upon the provisions of the Budget; (2) that a sufficient member of representative Indians of position and experience may be nominated to the Council of the Secretary of State on the recommendation of the elected Members of the Viceroy's and Local Legislative Councils; and (3) that each year a Select committee of the House of Commons may be appointed to inquire into and report upon the financial condition of India:

(ii) As regards the progress of Expenditure, it is prayed that the Military and

other unproductive expenditure be reduced, that larger amounts be spent in promoting the welfare and the progress of the people, and that a large saving and a more efficient administration may be obtained by the substitution, as far as practicable, of Indian for European agency in the higher grades of the Public service ; and

(iii) As regards apportionment of charges, it is prayed that the Imperial Treasury may bear a fair proportion of all expenditure in which the common interests of India and the rest of the Empire are involved : and especially that the expenses of the present war beyond the frontier may be largely borne by the Imperial Exchequer. Lastly, that it be an instruction to the President to submit a copy of this Resolution under his own signature to the Chairman of the Royal Commission with the least practicable delay.

4. That this Congress concurs with its predecessors in strongly advocating:—

(*a*) Persistant pressure by the Government of India on all Provincial Administrations to induce them to carry out in its integrity the excise policy enunciated in paragraphs 103, 104 and 105 of the Despatch published in the *Gazette of India* of March 1890, and the introduction of a simple system of effective local option. (*b*) a modification of the rules under the Arms Act so as to make them equally applicable to all residents in, or visitors to, India without distinction of creed, caste or colour, to ensure the liberal concession of licences wherever wild animals habitually destroy, human life, cattle or crops ; and to make all licenses granted under the revised rules, of life long tenure revocable only on proof of misuse, and valid throughout the Provincial jurisdiction in which they are issued ; (*c*) the establishment of Military Colleges in India, whereat Natives of India, as defined by Statute, may be educated and trained for a Military career as Commissioned or Non-Commissioned officers (according to capacity and qualifications) in the Indian Army ; (*d*) the authorizing and stimulating of a widespread system of volunteering, such as obtains in Great Britain, amongst the people of India ; (*e*) the discontinuance of the grant of exchange compensation allowance to the non-domiciled European and Eurasian employes of Government ; (*f*) the abolition of the Council of the Secretary of State for India ; (*g*) the establishment of a High Court of Judicature in the Punjab.

And this Congress, concurring with its predecessors, records its protests :—

(*a*) Against the scheme of reorganisation of the Educational Service which has receievd the sanction of the Secretary of State, as being calculated to exclude natives of India, even those who have been educated in England, from the superior grade of the Educational Service to which they have hitherto been admitted, (the words of the Resolution being : " In future natives of India who are desirous of entering the Education Department will usually be appointed in India and to the Provincial service") advocating that the scheme may be so recast as to afford facilities for the admission of Indian graduates to the superior grade of the Educational Service.

(*b*) Against the present rate of the Salt Tax, which produces great hardship to the poorest classes of the country, a hardship which renders it incumbent upon the Government to take the earliest opportunity to restore the duty to its level of 1888.

(*c*) Against the disabilities imposed on Indian settlers in South Africa, and the invidious and humiliating distinctions made between them and European settlers, appealing to Her Majesty's Government and the Government of India to guard the interests of Indian settlers and to relieve them of the disabilities to which they are subjected.

(*d*) Against the retrograde policy of the Government of India in nominating a gentleman for the Central Provinces to the Supreme Legislative Council without asking local bodies to make recommendations for such nomination, entertaining the earnest hope that Government will be pleased to take early steps to give to the Central Provinces the

same kind of representation that it has already granted to Bengal, Madras, Bombay and the North Western Provinces.

And this Congress, also concurring with its predecessors, expresses its firm conviction :—

(*a*) That in the interests of the public, the Medical science and the Profession, as also in the cause of economic administration, (1) there should be only one Medical Military Service with two branches, one for the European Army and one for Native troops, worked on indentical lines; (2) the Civil Medical Service of the country should be reconstituted as a distinct and independent Medical Service, wholly detached from its present Military connection and recruited from the open profession of Medicine in India and elsewhere, with due regard to the utilization of indigenous talent, other things being equal and (3) there should be a thorough open enquiry into the status and claims of Civil Assistant Surgeons and Hospital Assistants with a view to the redressing of long standing anomalies and consequent, grievances.

(*b*) That the time having come when greater facilities are imperatively required for higher education and the proper development of the Indian intellect than what are at present offered by examinations alone, the Acts of Incorporation of the Universities of Calcutta Madras and Bombay should be amended so as to provide for the introduction of teaching functions and for a wider scope of learning so as to suit generally the requirements of the present day.

(*c*) That, having regard to the facility of intercourse between all parts of India and Assam, the time has now arrived when the Inland Emigration Act I of 1882 as amended by Act VII of 1893 should be repealed.

(*d*) That it is desirable that in future no Indian Prince or Chief should be deposed on the ground of mal-administration or misconduct until the fact of such mal-administration or misconduct shall have been established to the satisfaction of a public Tribunal which shall command the confidence alike of Government and of the Indian Princes and Chiefs.

(*e*) That, having regard to the opinion of the Jury Commission as to the success of the system of trial by Jury, and also the fact that with the progress of education a sufficient number of educated persons is available in all parts of the country, the system of trial by Jury should be extended to districts and offences to which at present it does not apply, and that the verdicts should be final.

5. That this Congress, concurring with previous Congresses, again records its deep regret that the labours of the Public Service Commission have practically proved void of any good result to the people of this country, and repeats its conviction that no satisfactory solution of the question is possible unless effect is given to the Resolution of the House of Commons of the 2nd June 1893, in favour of holding the competitive examinations for the Indian Civil Services, viz., Civil, Medical, Police, Engineering, Telegraph, Forest, and Accounts, both in India and in England. This Congress would once again respectfully urge on Her Majesty's Government that the Resolution of the House of Commons should be speedily carried out as an act of justice to the Indian people and as the only adequate fulfilment of the pledges made to them.

6. That this Congress, being of opinion that the Government of India Notification of 25th June 1891 in the Foreign Department gagging the Press in Territories under British administration in Native States, is retrograde, arbitrary and mischievous in its nature, and opposed to sound statesmanship and to the liberty of the people, again, enters its emphatic protest against the same and urges its cancellation without delay.

7. That this Congress enters its emphatic protest against the Policy of Government in Provinces where the settlement of land revenue is periodical in reducing the duration of the settlement while enhancing its amount, and expresses its firm conviction that in

the interests of the country it is absolutely necessary that the land revenue in such Provinces should be permanently settled.

8. That this Congress notices with satisfaction the support of public opinion both in England and in India which the question of the separation of Judicial from Executive functions in the administration of Justice has received ; and this Congress once again appeals to the Government of India and the Secretary of State to take practical steps for speedily carrying out this much-needed reform.

9. That this Congress is glad to note that the Government of India has appointed a Famine Commission and hopes that the Commission will institute a searching enquiry into the matter. At the same time this Congress once again desires to repeat its conviction that famines are due to the great poverty of the people, brought on by the drain of the wealth of the country which has been going on for years together, and by the excessive taxation and over-assessment consequent on a policy of extravagance followed by the Government both in the Civil and Military departments, which have so far impoverished the people that at the first touch of scarcity they are rendered helpless and must perish unless fed by the State or helped by private charity. In the opinion of this Congress the true remedy against the recurrence of famine lies in the adoption of a policy which would enforce economy, husband the resources of the State, foster the development of indigenous and local arts and industries, which have practically been extinguished, and help forward the introduction of modern arts and industries.

10. That this Congress expresses its heart-felt gratitude to the British public and to the peoples of the British Colonies, the United States of America and other foreign countries for the generous aid afforded by them to the starving millions of this country during the late dreadful visitation of famine, and also wishes to place on record its high appreciation of the services which many men and women—English and Indian—residing in this country rendered, and the pecuniary help they gave for the relief of those afflicted by that calamity.

And that it be an instruction to the various Congress Committees to raise a sum of a thousand pounds, to be sent to the Lord Mayor of London on behalf of the Congress, in order that he might be pleased to put some memorial in some conspicuous part of London expressing the gratitude of the people of India for the help rendered to them during the time of the last famine.

11. That, having regard to the wisdom of the policy of appointing to the Governorships of Madras and Bombay statesmen from England to the exclusion of the Services in India, this Congress is of opinion that it is desirable that the Executive Governments of those Provinces should be administered by the Governors with Councils of three Members and not of two Members, as at present, and that one of the three Councillors should be other than a member of the Indian Civil Service.

12. That this Congress respectfully deprecates the exercise by the Government of the extraordinary powers vested in them by Bengal Regulation III of 1818, Madras Regulation II of 1819, and Bombay Regulation XXV of 1827 at a time of peace and quiet, and submits that such powers should be exercised only under such limitations as will ensure their being put in force with the utmost circumspection and care and under a sense of the highest responsibility by the Government.

(*a*) This Congress therefore urges that none of these Regulations should be put into force except after notification by the Local Government concerned that the circumstances contemplated by the preamble of the Regulations exist in its Province or in some definite area within the Province, and that it intends, if necessary, to exercise the powers vested in it ; and further that in no case should such powers extend to keeping a person arrested under

them in custody for a period longer than three months without his being brought to trial before a Court of Justice.

(*b*) That this Congress, while feeling that the Government of Bombay must have acted under a sense of responsibility in arresting the Sardars Natu under Bombay Regulation XXV of 1827, is yet of opinion, that, five months having now elapsed from such arrest, it is the duty of the Government, in the interests of justice, and also to allay the disquiet and uneasiness which has been created in the minds of the people at large by the arrest, to bring them—the Sardars Natu—to trial without delay, or, if the Government have no sufficient evidence against them to place before a Court of Justice, to release them.

13. That this Congress views with alarm and anxiety the changes proposed in the existing law of sedition as defined in Section 124A, and of circulating false reports as defined in Section 505 of the Indian Penal Code, and is of opinion that Section 124A of the Indian Penal Code requires amendment, not in the direction of greater stringency but in that of greater freedom, and if the law of sedition in India is to be made the same as it is in England, the administration of it ought to be safe-guarded substantially in the same way as it is there, namely, that the trial of accused persons must always be by jury, at least one half of whom should be persons of the same nationality as the accused, and that their verdict should be unanimous. And this Congress strongly protests against cases of sedition being made triable by Magistrate and not by Courts of Sessions and High Courts exclusively, as heretofore, and against the proposal to invest District Magistrates with the power of calling upon persons who, in their opinion, disseminate disaffection, to find sureties of good behaviour for twelve months. This Congress is further of opinion that the changes in the law now proposed will be altogether at variance with the pledges given by Sir James Fitz James Stephen when passing Section 124A of the Indian Penal Code through the Council and will deal an irreparable blow to liberty of speech and freedom of the press, thus retarding the progress of the country and creating terror instead of confidence in the minds of the people.

That a copy of this Resolution be submitted to the Legislative Council by the President.

14. That this Congress desires to record its protest against the Criminal Procedure Bill of 1897 now pending before the Imperial Legislative Council as being a retrograde and reactionary measure, which will add to the already large powers of the Police, invest Magistrates with a discretionary authority which they do not now possess, and curtail the powers of the High Courts, all to the extreme prejudice of accused persons.

15. That this Congress, while thanking the Government for granting the boon of a Legislative Council to the Punjab, places on record its regret that they have not extended to the Councillors the rights of interpellation, and to the people the right of recommend ing Councillors for nomination such as are enjoyed by the Councillors and people in the other Provinces.

16. That the Province of Berar, though not a part of British India, is administered by the Governor-General-in-Council in the same way as any portion of British India, but the important work of legislating for the province is performed by the Executive, instead of by the Legislative Council, resulting often in unsuitable and inconvenient legislation. This Congress, therefore, humbly prays that so long as Berar is administered by the Governor-General-in-Council all laws and orders having the force of law intended for Berar should be enacted by the Supreme Legislative Council in the same way as those for British India proper.

17. That this Congress prays that the scope of the Famine Commission appointed by the Government of India be extended so as to include an enquiry into the causes

of periodical famines and the remedies for the prevention of the same.

18. That this Congress again expresses its full and unabated confidence in Mr. Dadabhai Naoroji as the representative of the people in India, and hopes that he will be re-elected by his old Constituency of Central Finsbury or any other Liberal Constituency.

19. That this Congress desires to convey to Sir William Wedderburn and the other members of the British Committee its most grateful thanks for their disinterested services in the cause of Indian Political advancement.

And that a sum of Rs. 60,000 be assigned for the expenses of the British Committee and cost of the Congress publication *India*, and also for the expenses of the Joint-General Secretary's Office, and that the several Circles do contribute, as arranged, either now, or hereafter in Committee, for the year 1898.

20. That this Congress re-appoints Mr. A. O. Hume, C.B., to be General Secretary, and Mr. D. E. Wacha to be Joint-General Secretary for the ensuing year.

21. That the Fourteenth Indian National Congress do assemble, on such day after Christmas Day 1898 as may be later determined upon, at Madras.

READY FOR SALE

The Upanishads.

With Text in Devanagiri, Sankara's Commentary
and English Translation.

Published by :—V. C. SESHACHARRI B.A. B.L. M.R.A.S.

FIRST VOLUME.

Isa, Kena & Mundaka.

Price			
	CLOTH BOUND	Rs.	2-0-0
	PAPER		1-8-0

SECOND VOLUME.

Katha & Prasna

Price			
	CLOTH BOUND	Rs.	1-8-0
	PAPER		1-0-0

Note : The other volumes are in speedy preparation.

APPLY TO—

G. A. NATESAN & Co., PRINTERS,
ESPLANADE, MADRAS.

MADRAS.

G. A. NATESAN & Co. PRINTERS.

1898.